National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

VOL. XI....NO. 21. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1850. WHOLE NO. 541.

Published Weekly, BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

Terms: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New York

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

THE IMPRISONMENT OF COLORED SEAMEN.

Debate in the Senate on the amendment of Mr. Seward to the Slave Trade Bill, providing for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

IN THE SENATE.....Wednesday, Sept. 12.

The debate was renewed by Mr. SOULÉ, of La. We are compelled to omit, as not essential, a portion of his remarks. We quote all that is material.

I come now to the facts stated in the letter from which the honorable Senator from Massachusetts read on yesterday, and to the legislation under which they are said to have occurred. I am happy that I have it in my power to lay such facts before the Senator as will enable him to correct the misapprehension under which he evidently labors, and to quiet his philanthropic scruples. I take upon myself to assert that the acts set forth in the letter are unfounded and untrue. Sir, they cannot have occurred under the laws in force in Louisiana; the people of New Orleans are too orderly and well behaved to suffer such gross violations of those laws within that city as the facts stated would imply. I will say, without fear of contradiction, that there is no place in the whole Union where the police is more active in protecting the stranger, and in seeing that justice be done to him. We scorn there all those petty prejudices which unfortunately prevail to such a deplorable extent in other places, and we tender to the stranger who visits us a still surer protection than that of the law, the shield of a warm heart and of an unaffected hospitality. Sir, such things as those described in the letter would not be tolerated a single day, nor a single hour. They cannot have happened; they have not happened; and there is not, I am sure, a shipmaster who would endorse them except the one over whose signature they are made to appear. That the Senate may judge of the degree of credit which they deserve, it will suffice to read from the statute book of Louisiana the provisions which regulate the very matters in controversy. By a law of the Territorial Legislature of Louisiana, passed in 1807, which, like all other laws emanating from that body, must be presumed to have received the sanction of Congress, it is provided:—

"That no free negro or mulatto shall emigrate to or settle in this Territory, after the passage of this act, under penalty of twenty dollars for every week any such person shall remain in the territory, after the expiration of two weeks; and any free negro or mulatto who shall refuse or neglect to pay the fine imposed by this act or who shall not give such security to any judge or justice of the peace of the parish in which they shall be found, for his departure from this territory within two weeks, as the said judge or justice shall approve of, shall be committed to the jail of the parish, and may be sold therefrom by the judge of the parish after ten days' notice, of such sale, *for a term sufficient to pay the fines herein imposed*, with the costs; and in case that no person should buy such man of color for the space of time above mention, he shall then be employed at public works during as many days as he shall have remained in the territory after the two weeks aforesaid."

Such was the legislation which obtained in Louisiana up to 1830. The statute had remained a dead letter. Hundreds of those whom it was intended it should exclude from that State, had been suffered to remain and to settle there; and it was not until fresh provocations were offered to the slumbering suspicions of the Legislature that they thought of revising the existing laws. Nor did the provisions then enacted to correct an evil which had grown to the most alarming proportions, show any want of tenderness for the interests and convenience of those who had succeeded in introducing themselves into Louisiana in violation of the law of 1807. They were nearly all allowed a full amnesty; as the new provisions were only made to apply to such as had immigrated since 1825. Here are the provisions of the act of 1830:

"Sec. 1. All free negroes, mulattoes, or other free persons of color, who have come into this State since the first day of January, 1825, in violation of an act of the territory of Orleans, passed on the 14th day of April, 1807, entitled *An act to prevent the immigration of free negroes and mulattoes into the territory of Orleans*, shall, and may be arrested and proceeded against by warrant, before any judge, justice of the peace, or Mayor in this State; and upon due proof of the violation of said act, &c., &c., shall be ordered to depart therefrom within sixty days.

"Sec. 2. Any free negro, mulatto, or other free person of color, who, having been ordered to depart from this State, pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act, shall, after the period assigned for his departure, be found in any parish in this State, all such free negroes, &c., found within this State, in disobedience of such an order of departure and removal therefrom, shall be liable to be prosecuted before any court of competent jurisdiction, or before any judge, justice of the peace, or mayor, and upon due conviction of having disobeyed an order of departure or removal as provided for in the first section of this act, all such free negroes, mulattoes, and other free persons of color, shall by said court, judge, justice of the peace, or mayor, be sentenced to one year's imprisonment at hard labor: and if any free mulatto or other free person of color, ordered to depart from this State pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act, shall be convicted of a disobedience to such order, and sentenced to imprisonment as herein prescribed, all such free negroes, &c., shall be held and bound to depart from this State in thirty days after the expiration of their imprisonment, and on failure to depart within said thirty days, all such free negroes, &c., on due proof of a failure to depart from the state, as herein required, shall by said court, judge, justice of the peace, or mayor, be sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor for life."

"Sec. 3. All free negroes, malattoes, and other free persons of color, who shall come into this State as seamen attached to any vessel, or as cook, steward, or in any other capacity, and who shall not depart with said vessel, provided she is destined for an outward voyage, and if not, or is from any circumstance incapable of or not destined for departure, shall not depart within thirty days from this State, all such free negroes, &c., so coming into this State, and not departing therefrom as contemplated in this section, shall incur the penalties of the second section of this act, and be proceeded against as directed by the first and second sections of this act."

Sec. 4. If among the free persons of color who are subject to depart from this State there are any who hold property, &c., they shall, on proving the same before the acting Governor of the State, be allowed from him one year from the promulgation of this act," &c., &c.

And now, Mr. President, who is there in the provisions which I have just read that cannot bear comparison with the statute passed in 1788 by the Legislature of Massachusetts? Upon what ground could that State complain that the Legislature of Louisiana had transcended her constitutional powers in passing her prohibitory laws? Are the grievances stated in the letter introduced here based on any fact that can be borne out under the provisions of those laws? Where is the least authority conferred on anybody *to take seamen, cooks, and stewards out of ships lying sixty feet from the soil of Louisiana?* Why, sir, they are allowed to remain as long as the ship on board of which they came remains in port, if she be bound for an outward voyage; and if not destined for such a voyage, or in any way prevented from performing it, such colored persons as may have been brought on board of them are allowed thirty days before they are required to depart, and then only, and in default of their doing so, can they be subject to the penalties denounced by the statute. Besides, even when found delinquent, they can only be arrested and proceeded against *by warrant*. And, in connection with this, let me remark also that it is no part of the duties of the harbor masters to issue or to *execute warrants of arrest*; and that, therefore, the statement *that hundreds have been taken out of ships by them, handcuffed and taken into custody* is as unfounded as the other allegations in the same paper are malicious and untrue. I deny them all. I deny them most emphatically. The letter contains no reliable statement; for its author stands convicted of unmitigated falsehood, as far as the facts by him set forth are made to rest on the actual legislation of Louisiana, and on the manner in which it is enforced in New Orleans.

It has also been said, upon the authority of I know not what certificate, that twelve hundred colored seamen were taken out annually from ships arriving at the port of New Orleans and thrown into prison. May I not be permitted to cast a glance over that certificate?

Mr. WINTHROP. I said nothing about any certificate to that effect. I merely said that a statement of that sort had been made to me some years ago, which I had found among my files. It was made to me by the keeper of a "Seamen's Home" in New York, who seemed to be very intelligent on the subject, and stated doubtless that which he thought to be true.

Mr. SOULÉ And is that the source whence the honorable senator would expect to find truth, and which he disdains not to cover with the folds of his senatorial mantle? There is not a word of truth in these statements—not a word. I pronounce them absolute untruths. The honorable senator must now perceive how grossly he has been deceived; and, while I exonerate him fully from all intent to propagate these abject calumnies, knowing them to be such, he will thank me, I am sure, for redressing his judgment upon them, and for relieving his sympathies from the agony which they seem to have suffered on their account.

Sir, I had not intended to dwell so long on this most unwelcome topic of debate, and I will end what I have to say by expressing my deep regret that it has at all been introduced here. That Massachusetts should revive at this day, under the circumstances that surround us, what constitutional scruples she may have entertained with respect to the matters alluded to, after she had suffered them to slumber all the time while seventeen new States were coming into the Union with that most obnoxious discrimination, and when she might so appropriately have indulged them in procuring the repeal of such of her own laws as were blotted with it, betrays, I am afraid, that there are yet latent and sore energies in the spirit of hostility so long entertained against the South by certain portions of the North, which no hecatomb of our rights would moderate, nor even the passage of the so-called peace measures entirely consume and exhaust.

Mr. BERRIEN. Mr. President, in consequence of a statement made yesterday, by the Senator from Massachusetts, I find myself under the necessity of offering a brief explanation to the Senate. That statement relates to the laws of certain southern States, to which he has referred. After having denounced the proceedings under these laws as abuses, he proceeded to speak of certain evidence in his possession of the facts stated in the papers to which he referred. Among the best evidence, the senator either produced or referred to a certificate given by the keeper of a house for colored seamen, or colored persons, affirming, if my recollection is right as to numbers, that there were annually imprisoned in New Orleans twelve hundred colored seamen. The senator will correct me if I mistake.

Mr. WINTHROP. I believe that was the estimate.

Mr. BERRIEN. In Charleston there were said to be five hundred imprisoned annually; in Savannah, three hundred; and in Mobile a number which I do not recollect. Now sir, that statement, presented to the Senate of the United States, in the discussion of the question which is now commanding universal attention, is so presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, without any disavowal of the authority, or question as to the credit of the individual making the statement, and with the applied affirmance of that authority and credit by the act of presentation. For, sir, unless the senator from Massachusetts gave credit to the statement, it could not be presumed that he would have offered it to the consideration of the Senate of the United States, in the discussion of a question so grave as this. I am required then, on the part of that people—my constituency—to meet the statement presented by a Senator in his place, and which goes into circulation throughout the United States under the implied sanction of that Senator. This is to me a very unpleasant task. I have pleasure in vindicating my constituents from any imputation so false, foul, and calumnious as this is, but it gives me pain to speak as I am compelled to speak of the exhibition of such a statement in the Senate of the United States. I have to say then, sir, that this statement, in all its particulars, is false, and that there is no law existing in the State of Georgia under which such proceedings could have taken place. I affirmed this fact at the moment; but I have in the interval made an abstract of the laws of the State on the subject, for the purpose of showing, by their provisions, the utter impossibility that such a state of facts could have existed. I make this explanation at the disadvantage which necessarily attends such a procedure as that adopted by the Senator from Massachusetts. The statement which was made yesterday is circulated throughout the Union. The people of the city of Savannah—a city comparatively small in dimensions and population—are represented as annually imprisoning three hundred colored persons in abuse of their rights, and without charge of any offence committed by them. Now, sir, it is only necessary to look to an abstract of the laws of the State of Georgia upon this subject, for the purpose of making it entirely apparent how unfounded is this accusation. I have here an abstract of the laws:—

RESTRICTIONS ON COLORED SEAMEN AND OTHERS.

1. Not permitted to leave the vessel from the hours of six o'clock in the evening until five o'clock the succeeding morning. The duty of the captain to report a particular description of the seamen, and their names.

2. Captain requireth to give bond with sureties for the maintenance of the seaman, for retaining him on board of his vessel, and for carrying him away when his vessel departs.

3. Duty of captain to report within twenty four hours after his arrival, to the mayor, &c., any colored persons, and to give this bond, under the penalty of one hundred dollars for each colored person omitted.

4. Vessels coming from any port in any other State or foreign country, having on board any free negro or person of color as a steward, mariner, or in any other capacity, or as a passenger, liable to *quarantine*; and negroes or persons of color residing on shore forbidden to have communication with them.

5. Such persons, *going on shore*, liable to be arrested by the warrant of the mayor, intendant, or any judge or justice of any superior or inferior court, and committed to prison until the vessel is departing, or until otherwise discharged by law.

6. Negroes or persons of color communicating with those on board liable to arrest, and on conviction, to corporal punishment, not exceeding thirty-nine lashes.

7. Captain to take away such negro as brought in, and pay the expenses of his detention when the vessel is ready to depart, and failing to do so, shall be liable, on conviction, to a penalty of five hundred dollars, and not exceeding three months imprisonment.

8. If the captain refuses or neglects, and the negro or person of color does not depart from the State within ten days, liable on conviction, to corporal punishment not exceeding thirty-nine lashes.

9. All negroes or persons of color arriving in Georgia, and all other persons, exempted from the operation of the act, who arrive in consequence of shipwreck, stress of weather, or other unavoidable accident, unless they fail to comply with the provisions of the act with the provisions of the act within one month.

The selling of free persons of color as slaves is expressly forbidden by law in Georgia.

You will perceive, on hearing this abstract of the laws of Georgia, that there is no inhibition on the arrival of free colored persons—nothing which forbids their going on shore to perform their daily work; but that they are only inhibited from leaving their vessels at night. You will perceive that the law directs its penal provisions to the captain who takes in the seamen, and not to the seamen himself; and that there is no provision for the renewal of punishment, from month to month, or from two months to two months, as in Massachusetts, by the law read by the senator from Louisiana.

These, sir, are the provisions of the law of Georgia. In the exercise of that power which they possess to make such police regulations as are necessary for their safety, and looking to the peculiar institution which exists among them, they have passed these acts. The force and operation of the penal provisions the Senate will perceive, are made chiefly to apply to the captain bringing in the negroes, and not to the negroes or colored persons themselves. They are permitted to come in, and are allowed to go ashore during the ordinary working hours, and are only prohibited from landing during the hours of the night, when their intercourse with our slaves might be abused to purposes inconsistent with our safety.

Let me add—for I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate—that the selling of free persons of color as slaves, under any circumstances, is expressly forbidden by the law of Georgia. And now, sir, upon this statement, I trust the American people, before whom this accusation has gone, will at least acquit my constituents of the obnoxious and unfounded charge.

Mr. WINTHROP. I had not intended to say another word this morning in regard to this vexed and exciting question; but the course of the senator from Georgia has compelled me to do so. Sir, if I understood an imputation which was made in the opening remarks of that senator, it was as ungeneorus as it was unjust. If I understood that imputation, sir, it was unworthy of him, and of the Senate chamber as it was of myself.

The PRESIDENT. The senator must not make such remarks. The Chair cannot permit it.

Mr. WINTHROP. And I may add, sir, that that imputation, if I understood it correctly, was in direct contradiction to the statement which that senator himself made yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and for which he is on record in the newspapers of this morning. I understood the senator to say just now that I had introduced a statement upon the subject of the imprisonment of free negroes in the port of Savannah; and that, not having intimated that I did not credit that statement, or did not vouch for its accuracy, I had made it my own statement; and that it was thus the statement of an American Senator which had gone before the American people under that authority. And it was with this utterly unfounded preface that he proceeded to pronounce that statement false. Why, sir, I am fortunate in having evidence upon this subject. The senator from Georgia interrupted me yesterday for explanation, soon after I introduced this topic; and this was his remark! "*I am very glad* (said he) *to hear that the senator from Massachusetts did not vouch for the truth of that statement.*" That was his own expression.—It is too late for the senator to attempt to get behind it. He is on record for the very words; and I leave therefore, any imputation upon myself, which might otherwise have resulted from his language to day, as it deserves to be left, to return where it came from.

Sir, everybody knows how that statement was introduced. There was no mistake—there could have been no unintentional mistake in regard to it. I said that it was a statement which had been furnished me, in relation to this subject some seven or eight years ago. I intimated at the instant I introduced it, that it might be as extravagant as it appeared to be on its face. I stated expressly that I did not vouch for it any degree; that I did not "vouch for it at all." I said this, not in answer to any question put to me by the Senator, or by anybody else; but as an original, unprompted expression of my own.—But I said, also, that if one person in the United States believed that such enormities were practised or perpetrated to such an extent, it was a sufficient reason for investigating the circumstances of the case and bringing it before some responsible judicial tribunal. The Senator forgets himself when he attempts to make me, in the slightest degree, responsible for anything which that statement contained.—He must deny his own declaration of yesterday, or he must acknowledge the wrong he has done me to day. There is no alternative.

But, sir, if evidence upon this subject is so emphatically demanded—if we are called upon to substantiate, by respectable witnesses, the facts which have been alleged in relation to this case, I desire to state the authority upon which I have acted upon this question, since I have had any connexion with it in either branch of Congress. Here, sir, is the original memorial, which is my letter of instructions on this subject. Let me read it, for the special edification of the Senator from Georgia:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your petitioners, citizens of the United States, and some of them owners and masters of vessels respectfully represent:

That on board of that large number of vessels accustomed to touch at the ports of Charleston Savannah, Mobile, and New Orleans, it is frequently necessary to employ free persons of color;

And whereas it frequently happens that such crews are taken from the vessels, thrown into prison, and there detained at their own expense, greatly to the prejudice and detriment of their interest and of the commerce of these States;

They pray your honorable body to grant them relief, and render effectual in their behalf the privileges of citizenship secured by the constitution of the United States;

And as duty bound will ever pray.

And now, sir, by whom was this memorial signed? The Senator from Georgia, and other Senators here, will bear witness to the character of some of the names which I shall proceed to read: Benjamin Rich, Samuel Appleton, Josiah Bradlee, Benjamin Bangs, William Appleton, Thomas Lamb, J. Ingersoll Bowditch, Robert G. Shaw, Thomas Motley, William Sturgis, James K. Mills, and Thomas H. Perkins.—Here, sir, are twelve names which will serve as a specimen of the merchantile character and standing which this memorial represents.

William Prescott, Charles Jackson, William Minot, Franklin Dexter, Charles P. Curtis, Benjamin Rand, Sidney Barlett, W. H. Gardiner, George Morey, John C. Gray, Charles G. Loring, and Benjamin R. Curtis These, sir, will furnish a sample of the judicial and legal ability by which it is endorsed.

Abbott Lawrence, our present Minister to England Henry Lee, the South Carolina candidate for the Vice Presidency in 1812; William H. Prescott, the author of Ferdinand and Isabella, whose name may stand alone as the representative of American literature.

These, Mr. President, are some of the names upon which I rest my intervention on this subject. It is not, sir, by any insignificant colored person, if he be insignificant—it is not by any humble ship-master of Boston, if he be humble; that these facts have been brought forward, and an investigation demanded.—It is by more than one hundred and fifty citizens of Massachusetts, many of whom are deeply interested in commerce and navigation; others of whom are eminently distinguished in legal, scientific, and literary pursuits; and who, taken together, represent as much of intelligence, virtue, and patriotism, as can be found in the same number of persons in any part of the Union.

Sir, I protest against this attempt to create a false clamor on this subject, by making issue upon little items of evidence, or little scraps of statement, which may have been adduced here incidentally, with no purpose to vouch for the accuracy of their details, but only with the object of showing distinctly to the Senate and to the country that there is believed to be an enormous abuse upon this subject, which demand investigation. Who has the face to deny that there is such an abuse? Why, sir, upon this question there are some facts which cannot be disputed. It is a fact, in the first place, that these odious laws exist. The statute-books are the evidence of that fact. And if those of the State of Louisana or of Georgia do not entirely conform to the views which have been given of them, no man denies that the laws of South Carolina on this subject are precisely what they have already been represented to be.

In the second place, sir, it is a fact that these laws are executed. No man denies that they are executed, both upon our seamen and upon foreign seamen. We know it by unimpeachable records, upon one of which the Senator from Georgia has himself pronounced an official opinion. We know it by the records of other countries as well as our own. Why, sir, if I mistake not, this question has been brought before the Parliament of Great Britian within a few months past. I believe that at the very last session of Parliament the subject was most significantly noticed in the House of Common, as having been brought to the attention of the Secretary of State in this country by the British Minister, owing to the recent seizure of more than one British sailor. These ottrages and abuses have been perpetrated upon British as well as upon American vessels.

In the third place, sir, it is a fact that these laws have been pronounced unconstitutional by the highest judicial authority. We know that Mr. Justice Johnson, himself a citizen of South Carolina, gave an elaborate opinion that these laws were contrary to the Constitution of the United States. His opinion, to that effect, is in the very volume before me* where any one may see it.

And lastly, sir, it is a fact that, if we have been obliged to rely upon evidence gleaned here and there from the keeper of a colored home, or from the captain of a Massachusetts merchant-ship, it is because we have been refused the opportunity of obtaining authentic testimony through the proper and rightful channels. We know, and the Senator knows, that we attempted, in the first instance, to employ attorneys and lawyers in the Southern States for the purpose of investigating this question and bringing it to a decision before their own judicial tribunals, and that when we had failed in that attempt, agents of our own—most respectable and eminent persons—were employed, who were repulsed from your doors and turned away with indignity.

Sir, these are facts which no one can deny. And neither abuse nor imputation heaped unjustly upon a senator who may attempt to array them before the country, nor any miserable quibbling upon a statement which may have been brought here as showing the opinions and estimates which others may have formed upon the subject; neither the one nor the other can do away with these notorious and well-authenticated facts. You cannot rail them out of existence. They stand upon the records of the country; and there they will stand, a perpetual reproach and rebuke to those who insist that this question shall not be brought before a responsible tribunal, and shall not be tried in the ordinary constitutional manner.

Mr. BERRIEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts, by what I would charitably hope is a misapprehension, has misrepresented the remarks which I made, so far as that Senator is concerned, and has then, by an illogical conclusion, endeavored to escape from the implied censure which he feels to be the necessary result of those remarks. Sir, I have said to-day what I said yesterday, that I inquired from the Senator, at the moment, whether he vouched for the truth of the accusation contained in his certificate, and that he answered that he did not. There is, therefore, no discordance between my remarks of yesterday and those of this morning. The record is consistent. That act of declining to vouch for the truth of a statement which a Senator presents in this Chamber is one thing: that of presenting it, without any expression of belief or disbelief as to its credit until specifically interrogate I upon the question whether he did vouch for it, is another and very different thing. No Senator will fail to perceive the distinction.

Now, sir, I again assert, whatever censure may be implied in the declaration, that the presentment by a Senator in his place of a statement of alleged facts, unaccompanied by any expression of his belief or disbelief in the truth of such statement, implies that he offers it as one which is, in his judgment, entitled to credit, upon the plain and simple principle that no Senator can be presumed to present to the consideration of the Senate that which he himself thinks unworthy of belief. In that position the honorable Senator stood when I made the inquiry whether he would vouch for the truth of the facts asserted. He had presented the statement as appropriate to the subject under discussion; and that act, unaccompanied by any disavowal, was an affirmance of its title to credit. Looking to this course of proceeding on the part of the honorable Senator, and to the false and unfounded statement which he has presented to the Senate, and speaking as a citizen of Georgia—one of that people who are thus falsely accused—I reaffirm what I said yesterday, and now declare, that no title of that censure can be withdrawn or removed; nor can the conviction, which must force itself upon the minds of those who hear me, be obliterated by any observations which have fallen from the Senator from Massachusetts this morning.

Sir, I have not been quibbling about evidence; I have not been commenting or making strictures upon scraps of testimony, collected by those who are disposed to call into question the conduct of the Southern States upon this subject. That is the appropriate office of those who collect such scraps, and rely on them. I have met the charge of the honorable Senator by distinct, unanswerable evidence, which renders it impossible that it can be true—by showing that the laws of the State of Georgia give no such authority as that which has been charged to have been exercised, and that no such proceedings as those which are alleged could have occurred under them. Now sir, how is this met by the evidence which the Senator has produced this morning, supported by a long roll of respectable names? Far be it from me, sir, to raise a question of respectability with reference to any one of the gentlemen to whom the Senator has referred. But what do they state, and what are their means of information? Let us see:

"On board of that large number of vessels accustomed to touch at Charleston, Mobile, Savannah, and New Orleans, it is frequently necessary to employ free persons of color; and whereas it frequently happens that such persons are taken from the vessels and thrown into prison, and there detained at their own expense, &c."

Now, I beg to inquire how any of these respectable gentlemen who have put their names to this paper, thus vouching for the truth of its declaration, could have come to the knowledge of the facts which it asserts. They are not persons engaged in the navigation of these ships, so that in that capacity they could have personal knowledge of these facts. No, sir; the allegation is unquestionably founded on information which they derived from others; and the credit which is due to that memorial does not, therefore, depend at all upon the character of the gentlemen whose names have been read by the honorable Senator, but upon that of those from whom they obtained their information. I say nothing of the respectability of the gentlemen whose names have been read; some of them are known to me. All of them, I doubt not, are respectable; but a memorial to Congress is no evidence of the facts which it asserts. Such a memorial is subscribed and presented with the knowledge that before any action is had by Congress upon the subject, the facts which it alleges must be inquired into and proved. Those who subscribe the paper should certainly believe what they allege, and those who present and urge it should be prepared to prove what it asserts; but upon the paper itself, a mere petition or memorial to Congress, I maintain that there is no respectability of character, and no number of names of men of any standing, which can impart to it verity, when it obviously relates to facts of which they could have no personal knowlecge.

As to Georgia, sir, the evidence which I have adduced manifestly withdraws her from the operation of this statement and these denunciations. And now, Mr. President, as to the supposed difficulty of obtaining evidence of the abuses which are alleged to have been committed, I understand that this allegation is confined to certain proceedings which have taken place in the State of South Carolina. I do not apprehend that any Senator will venture to assert here in his place that there are any facts authorizing such a complaint in relation to the State of Georgia that any one has ever been refused access to the records for the purpose of obtaining information of any judicial proceedings, or has ever been prevented from testing the constitutionality of any act upon her statute-book, through the medium of the courts of justice it would be intrusive for me to enter into any vindication of the act of South Carolina, or of the conduct of her judicial tribunals, and I abstain from doing so; but, sir, I cannot forbear at a moment like this to add, that if the feeling which is manifested upon this occasion, and which has been so frequently manifested of late by Senators on this floor, is a true indication of the feelings of the people of those States from which those Senators come, they are calculated, (I trust they are not so intended,) but they are certainly and inevitably calculated to produce and to fasten a conviction on the Southern mind that we are unfit associates for each other. I do not attempt to say whether the merit or demerit which thus unfits us for association belongs to the South or to the North; but if this incessant war is to be kept up *de die in diem*; if it is to be arrayed against our institutions; if we are within this hall and elsewhere to be constantly denounced and assailed by remarks calculated to wound and irritate the feelings of slaveholders; if we are to be continually met by charges which are utterly false, and which disappear at the touch, I do not hesitate to repeat that you are forcing upon us the conviction, which we shall not always be able to resist, that we cannot much longer be considered fit associates for the people of the non-slaveholding States.

Mr. WINTHROP. Mr. President, I have already sufficiently answered and repelled the unfounded imputations of the Senator from Georgia. One word more as to his argument. The Senator from Georgia has not only forgotten what occurred here yesterday, but he has quite lost sight of the peculiar character of the question before us. He tells us that this perpetual war upon Southern institutions is about to dissolve the Union. God forbid, Mr. President, that anything should dissolve this Union! But, sir, let the Senator remember that the war which is the subject of this controversy, is a war upon our institutions and not upon his. It is the right of seizing our freemen, and not the right of interfering with his slaves, which is at stake upon this issue. You propose to insert into the bill before us a power to expel all free colored persons from the District of Columbia, on pain of being imprisoned at labor without limit. Your Southern laws authorize the seizure and imprisonment of our free colored sailors is it, then, a war upon Southern institutions which is now the subject of controversy? Or is it not rather a flagrant war upon Northern institutions and upon sailors' rights, and a war of the Senator's own waging? In the same manner, sir, the Senator from Georgia, with less than his usual care in examining questions of evidence, has omitted, in reading this memorial, to take any notice of the caption. It may have been an undesigned, but it was by no means an unimportant omission. He intimated that this memorial was worth nothing as a matter of testimony, because it contained only the names of people who knew nothing personally upon this question. I must read the caption of the memorial once more: "Your petitioners, citizens of the United States, and some of them *owners and masters of vessels.*" Sir, these masters of vessels speak that which they know. They testify that which they have seen—that which they have witnessed or experienced in their own persons and on board their own vessels. The Senator must admit, therefore, that I was right in speaking of this memorial as evidence upon the question under consideration. And it is such evidence, sir, as he will in vain attempt to rebut, and as he will not venture to treat with contempt.

Mr. BERRIEN. I did not overlook the caption of that memorial; but the Senator from Massachusetts sought to give credence to that memorial as evidence by referring to the names, of known respectability, affixed to it.

The argument I addressed to the Senate, was that these persons, so referred to for that purpose, must have derived their information from others, and could, therefore, give no credit to the statement.

The honorable Senator says in reply to my remark, that this incessant war upon our institutions will lead us to a state of feeling which will convince us that we are unfit associates for each other, that this is not a war upon Southern institutions, but upon the institutions of the North, upon the question whether northern freemen may be imprisoned in Southern ports. In one sense this is not a war upon Southern institutions. It is not a question whether, by the operation of these laws, you shall diminish or destroy the value of southern property. No, sir, it is a war upon Southern safety. It is not a war upon our particular institutions; but a war upon our personal safety. The safety of our wives and children is endangered by these northern emissaries coming to those people who are the subjects of our particular institutions; and though I trust, with the Senator from Massachusetts, that nothing may occur to dissolve this Union, yet I do not hesitate to tell him that there is not, in my belief, a Southern State in the true sense of that term, which if divested of the right to pass those police laws which they deem essential to their safety, to the security of their wives and children, to their protection from servile insurrection by the allowance of these emissaries from the North—these colored emissaries from the North—to intermingle with that population, is convinced that they are deprived of their constitutional obligations of the right to pass these laws, which are indispensable to their safety, there is not a Southern State which would not be brought to a conclusion from which every feeling of my heart revolts.

Mr. EWING. I do not, myself, Mr. President, give much weight in legislation to ordinary letters, whether they be anonymous, or vouched for by respectable names. They, amount, in general, to little more than a mere statement of the information or opinion of the individual, very frequently founded upon no facts whatever, or upon few facts, with much inference. I should have given very little weight, beyond the single case stated as occurring within the actual knowledge of the writer, to the letter introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts, if it had called forth no comments and no contradiction. But, at the same time, I do not think a senator liable to any just reproach or harsh animadversions, for introducing a letter into the Senate, especially if he takes care to say that he does not vouch for the truth of its statements. Indeed, the Senator from Massachusetts had a worthy precedent near at hand for dealing in this kind of evidence. Why, sir, it is but a very few days, perhaps I should rather say weeks, since, in debate here, the Senator from Georgia, (Mr. Berrien) introduced and read in the Senate, a letter from California, written by a respectable gentleman to another respectable gentleman, the names of neither of whom that honorable Senator saw fit to give; on the authority of which letter the honorable Senator thought proper to insist, in a very direct and emphatic manner, that the military officers and diplomatic agents of the Government had deluded the people of California into the adoption of the Anti-Slavery proviso in their constitution. The honorable Senator from Georgia did not vouch for that statement at all. He argued from it, he reasoned from it, as if he believed it to be true: and when I contradicted the statement, he still dwelt upon it with no diminished emphasis; and his speech, which has since been published, shows that he felt himself authorized to treat it as a fact proved. I took care then to advise the honorable Senator that the statement was without foundation, and I now say, as I then said, though in more emphatic terms, that every word of it, which charges such interference on that question, is false. Yet I imputed then, and now impute nothing to the Senator from Georgia unworthy of his character and station; not at all. But, certainly he stood in no more favorable situation than does the Senator from Massachusetts, whom he animadverts upon with so much severity now, for having introduced a letter, the name of the writer of which he gave us, and for whose statements he declared he did not vouch.

Mr. BERRIEN. This is a personal assault, which requires a word from me.

Mr. EWING. It is no assault at all, but a mere narrative of what occurred here but a few weeks ago.

Mr. BERRIEN. It is the lamest and most impotent attempt at an analogy that ever was presented to the consideration of a body of intelligent men. I introduced a letter. I was not called upon for the name of the writer. I said it was a letter addressed by a respectable citizen of Baltimore, formerly, to a member of this Senate, who would vouch for his respectability. Now, sir, is there any analogy between these two cases? I did believe, upon the testimony which I had received, that that letter was entitled to credit; and I argued from it as so entitled. But with respect to the statement which the senator from Ohio contests, it is a statement of a fact which could not have been within the knowledge of the Senator from Ohio, but of which the writer, of that letter might have had personal knowledge. Consequently, notwithstanding the contradiction of the Senator from Ohio, that letter remains as evidence, with the credit of a letter vouched for in the manner I have stated. I take the responsibility of avowing my belief in the truths stated in that letter. I did so at the time: I do so now. I did it upon the authority to which I have referred, and which I stated to the Senate. Whenever any Senator shall present a letter or other paper, giving reference to the authority upon which he relies for giving credence to it, then he will be in the condition in which I was when I presented the letter to which the Senator from Ohio alludes, not in that of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. EWING. One word more with respect to that letter. If my memory serves me, it stood in precisely the same situation in which the honorable Senator places the memorial of the ship owners and ship masters of Boston, which the honorable senator says is no evidence whatsoever, because they had no personal knowledge of what they stated. The writer of that letter, if I am not mistaken, and if I am, the Senator can correct me, was not in California at the time the constitution was formed. I may be incorrect as to that fact, but my impression is that he was not, and that he does not say that he speaks from personal knowledge. Besides, sir, the only person representing the government in California, as is well known, and is known to the Senator from Georgia, was a distinguished gentleman from his own State, (Mr. T. Butler King,) who has denied, in most express terms, in a card published by himself, that he had ever said one single word upon the subject of the restriction of Slavery to a human being in California. That denial was published before the senator read the letter to the Senate.

Mr. BERRIEN. That denial was published, I presume. I have not seen it. I take it on the statement of the Senator from Ohio. But the statement to which I referred was in the debates of the convention in California, and made by a member of that body.

Mr. EWING. No such statement was made there.

Mr. BERRIEN. Not about a conversation with that gentleman?

Mr. EWING. Not at all, with respect to the matter in question.

Mr. BERRIEN. Was there no conversation with that agent, in which he requested that they would include the whole, in order to remove difficulty in the way of legislation on this subject?

Mr. EWING. Oh! certainly.

Mr. BERRIEN. Which unquestionably had reference to that.

Mr. EWING. That is not the subject in controversy between us. I said not a word about the boundaries of California.

Mr. BUTLER. I certainly have no angry feeling about this controversy, but the Senate will bear me witness that this is the fifth time that this law of South Carolina has been introduced by the Senators from Massachusetts, with a view to pronounce their censure and condemnation of it, upon the ground that it is inhumane, and that it is treating this black race in a way not contemplated by the constitution, and repugnant to the sentiments of that extremely sentimental people. [Laughter.] Now, sir, I did not introduce the subject, but I rise to say, upon this occasion, that if Massachusetts, or all the other States north of the Potomac, suppose that by any legislation here they can compel, or under duress law induce South Carolina to give up this police right of regulating this class of persons, they are vastly mistaken, for South Carolina will never give it up. Moreover, sir, I do not think that these complaints of the way in which these beings are regarded comes with a very good grace from Massachusetts. Why, how does one of their reverend, grave writers, Dr. Belknap say that the negro-children are regarded there? [Laughter.] He says:—

"Negro children were reckoned as an incumbrance in a family; and when we used to give away the puppies. [Laughter.] They have been publicly advertised in the newspapers, 'to be given away.'" [Great laughter.]

Mr. WINTHROP. How many years ago was that.

Mr. BUTLER. It was in 1781, I believe.

Mr. WINTHROP. Oh!

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have a very great respect for his ancestors. Yet, though I have a great respect for that Senator himself also, I do not believe he is any better or wiser than his ancestor who landed on Plymouth rock. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINTHROP. I wish I was half as good. But the Senator is slightly mistaken as to dates. My ancestor did not land at Plymouth rock at all; he came over ten years afterwards to Salem.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I was only showing you how your ancestors regarded these creatures. With regard to the witness whom the senator from Massachusetts has produced here—this man Ranlett—I had a conversation with a gentleman coming from the Navy Yard this morning, and he said he had no doubt that if there was any truth in the story, this man Ranlett went into Charleston with the negroes for salvage, and finding if he took the negroes out, they would have to divide it, and left them there, and took it all to himself. [Laughter.]

---

* The opinion of Justice Johnson is too long for insertion in this debate. But the following communication, which is among the printed documents of Congress, will indicate its character:

JUDGE JOHNSON TO MR. ADAMS.

CHARLESTON, July 3, 1834.

SIR: I know not from whom the Government expects communications such as the present, but I am daily made sensible that the eyes of the community are turned most particularly to the Judges of the Supreme Court for protection of their constitutional rights, while I feel myself destitute of the power necessary to realize that expectation.—Hence, *although obliged to look on and see the Constitution of the United States trampled on by a set of men who, I sincerely believe, are as much influenced by the pleasure of breaking its fetters as by any other consideration whatever*, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the President to the subject, as one which may not be unworthy of an official remonstrance of the Executive of the State.

In the envelope which encloses this I have taken the liberty to enclose three documents. The first is an act of the Legislature of this State passed at their last session, from which you will perceive how very far your expectations are from being realized, as you expressed them to Mr. Canning, in your letter of June 17th, 1823. The second is a paragraph from the *Charleston Mercury* of the 23d ultimo, from which it will be seen how pointedly the South Carolina Association, as it is called, are pressing the execution of that law. And the third is an article from the *Charleston Courier*, of the 29th, which contains a report of the case of Amos Dudley, from which it appears that he was a citizen of Rhode Island, and an articled seaman on board of an American vessel.

The ground of defence taken for him will also appear, and, in the disregard of

Mr. WINTHROP. And I have conversed to-day with two gentlemen who say that they know Captain Ranlett and they testify that he is a captain of high respectability and intelligence. One of them says that he now owns his own ship, and is just about to sail on a voyage on his own behalf. I only hope he will not have gone before he has an opportunity of explaining this matter for himself.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts. I will detain the Senate but a few moments with what I have to say. I regret that the debate which has sprung up, collaterally with the subject of this bill, has, in some parts of it, at least, been characterized with unnecessary harshness towards my colleague. I must say that I do not think it an unreasonable proposition on the part of Massachusetts to ask for the judicial decision of a question of constitutional right I think, on the contrary, it is what cannot, in any just exercise of power, be denied. This right is not derived, as some senators seem to suppose, from anything contained in any State constitution. It is secured—if secured at all to the party—by the Constitution of the United States, and by that instrument alone. If it has no foundation there, it has none anywhere. And it is the trial of that right by the tribunal prescribed by law which the State of Massachusetts has sought, and nothing more. It follows, as a matter of course, that that right is in no way dependant upon State Constitutions. It is in no way dependant upon the emigration laws of Louisiana, which have been referred to. It is in no way dependant upon any police regulations which may exist anywhere. But these police laws, if they interfere with the Constitution of the United States, and deprive us of any right therein secured are unlawful. This is the point to be settled, and it is surprising that there should be any opposition to it.

Sir, I have heard with some astonishment the question of fact in this matter brought into doubt here. There can be no question whatever about it. The State of Massachusetts did not proceed in this matter without evidence before her to satisfy her upon that point. She had, without doubt, evidence which satisfied her Legislature, and the other branches of her government, that complaints of this description were well founded, and she took measures accordingly. Well, sir, she sent an agent to Charleston. The people of Carolina are an honorable and high-minded people, and what did they do? Every one knows that they did not question the facts. The senator from South Carolina himself does not deny them. Our agent laid before the Governor of South Carolina the purport of his mission. The Governor did not deny the existence of such a law. He did not deny or question the facts alleged. He did not deny that there was a prison there for the purpose, and that these colored persons were confined in it. But treating the statement as well founded, he laid the whole subject before the Legislature of the State, alleging it was an attempt to interfere with the laws of the State, and the Legislature took steps to prevent the decision of this question by the judicial tribunals. Well, sir, if there had been no foundation for these complaints, as some gentlemen seem to suppose, there might have been a very plain answer given. That agent might have been told "you have come here upon a complaint that has no foundation; you have no real cause for legal or any other controversy, as these things which you allege as a grievance never take place; you may go into court if you can find a case to found a complaint upon." Sir, they took no such course as that, but on the contrary they opposed obstacles which proved insuperable to legal process. But I need not repeat these facts. The senator from South Carolina (Mr. Butler) admits, if I understand him, that they are to an extent true, though not to so great an extent as some suppose. The same thing is substantially true of Louisiana. The honorable senator from that State (Mr. Soulé) only argues from laws which he adduces that it is impossible that these things should take place. If, however, these practices do exist, his argument would prove they are unsupported by law which would only make them the more objectionable.

Mr. SOULE. I deny most positively that they can or do take place.

Mr. DAVIS. I can see that the senator draws a conclusion which conclusion is tantamount to a denial; but then he must admit that, under the laws which he has read, a person of description, after he has been in the State thirty days, is subject to this confinement. Now, I will not enter into any controversy with the Senator from Louisana, as I have no time to look into the laws of that State, but I will take an opportunity to do it, and I think I can show that in the cases where these individual have been imprisoned in Louisiana it has been done under some law there. At least I am unwilling to believe otherwise. That it has been done in Louisiana admits, in my opinion, of no doubt. There are ample proofs of it, according to my information, and I have no doubt it can be obtained. Well, sir, the same thing happened in Louisiana as in South Carolina. The Governor of Louisiana did not say to the gentleman who went from Massachusetts, "this is an unbounded complaint; it is untrue in itself; you have no cause to come here to redress imaginary wrong; your citizens have not been imprisoned." That would have been a full and complete answer; but no such answer was made. On the contrary, the subject was communicated to the Legislature for their consideration. I do not mean to impute any intentional misstatement or error to the Senator from Louisiana, but I think it will turn out that there is some law or authority which has been overlooked, or some existing practice or regulation; for that seamen sailing from the North have been seized and imprisoned at New Orleans admits of no doubt whatever, unless we have all been misled by evidence which we felt authorized to credit. However, Mr. President, I will dismiss the subject, for I am anxious not to detain the Senate in regard to it, since it was fully discussed on a former day.

And now, sir, I wish to add a few words in relation to the amendment proposed by the senator from New York (Mr. Seward.) This amendment is presented at a moment and under circumstances that I regret. I am sorry that the senator from New York thought it to be his duty to ask the attention of the Senate to the subject in this connexion. I have none of the difficulty which exist in the minds of many gentlemen here with regard to the power of Congress to deal with Slavery in this District.—I have no doubt in my mind that Congress has full constitutional power and authority to emancipate the slaves—none whatever. The grant of power is in terms too broad, clear and ample to admit of doubt. For one, I should rejoice to see it done; and under other and less objectionable circumstances I would give my support to a bill for that purpose, provided it gave ample security to all the rights of all the parties concerned. I have on other occasions, given proofs of the sincerity of the opinion. And while I say that I should have no difficulty in doing it, candor requires me to admit that if I considered, as many gentlemen here do, that it could reasonably be regarded as an aggression upon their constitutional rights, or an invasion of those rights, or that it would be an example which must necessarily be pernicious to them, I should forbear from doing it. But, in my view of the subject, I do not see that any such consequences as have been suggested could result from it; and therefore I should act upon it as if those objections had not been made.

But, sir, I do not think that the proposition of the senator from New York, under the circumstances which exist, commends itself to our support, and I will state in a very few words my reasons for not sustaining it. In the first place, the objection which my colleague makes to it is sound and unanswerable. He says that it may be the means of defeating the bill for the abolition of the slave trade, which we yet hope will take a form acceptable to us. He objects because it displaces that bill by striking it out and leaving no provision for the abolition of the slave trade, and then, if the proposition to emancipate the slaves should prove unacceptable to the people of the District, who are by the terms of the bill to decide whether they will agree to its provisions, the law becomes a nullity, and the slave trade will be left to be prosecuted as it now is. That, in my opinion, is a very serious objection, as I believe the chances are equal at least that the people will reject the law.—I cannot abandon a measure so earnestly desired by the public as the abolition of the slave trade upon so uncertain a contingency of a greater need. But the senator from New York will pardon me for saying that the bill itself introduced by him is a crude and ill-digested measure, full of imperfections. It does not make proper provisions to secure the rights of all parties. It turns, as my colleague justly observed, these persons who are now bound to Slavery over to freedom, without having any means whatever of supporting themselves. Old and young, sick and well, are, by a dash of the pen, to be naked and destitute into the streets, without the slightest provision to save them from starvation. There ought to be some just, suitable and proper provision made upon that point, to save them at least from crime and suffering, as there are many persons in this condition incompetent to provide for themselves so suddenly. In doing a humane act let us not lose sight of humanity. There ought to be many provisions, in relation to a subject so complicated as this is which I do not find in this bill, in order to do justice to all the parties concerned. The number should first be officially ascertained, and enough should be know of their condition and ability to provide for their physical necessities to enable us to judge what such an emergency demands of us. We know that a slave is incapable of holding property, and the moment emancipation takes place, the obligation of the master to provide for him ceases. While the bill is obviously too defective in this particular to become a law, it also fails to make any suitable provision for the indemnity of the masters. It proposes to appropriate two hundred thousand dollars, without any estimate of the value of the slaves, and to leave the whole matter to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, without providing any mode for determining the questions which must arise. It may well be doubted whether such a provision is constitutional, as there is no provision for a jury to ascertain the damages in disputed cases, nor in fact any provision for bringing any question before the courts; but whether constitutional or not it is too imperfect to stand the test of scrutiny. The bill is alike imperfect in other respects; but I shall not enter further into the discussion in order to point them out—those adverted to are fatal. While, therefore, I am in favor of the principle, I cannot support this amendment. I believe no one who has advocated the principle is satisfied with the proposed amendment. Even the mover is so conscious of a tendency to defeat the slave trade measure, that he has asked leave to withdraw it, in order that we may have an opportunity to pass that bill if we can put it into an acceptable form. This privilege, I regret to say, has been denied; and as we must vote upon the amendment under the circumstances which exist, I feel myself compelled to vote against it. It was not my purpose to do more than to notice some of the leading objections, that my vote might not be misunderstood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My own State has been frequently referred to in this debate as containing a provision in her Constituon similar to the one complained of in South Carolina, Louisiana, and other States. Illinois has a provision in her Constitution, making it the duty of the Legislature to provide efficient means for keeping all negroes from coming into the State who were not natives of, or residents in, the State at the time of the adoption of that instrument. Here then is a clear case of legislation of this description in a free State, and I would much rather see this controversy going on between two free States of the Union, than too see it made a sectional question between a slave and a free State. We, too, have a constitutional provision upon this subject, and before that constitutional provision was adopted by an overwhelming majority of our people—it having been submitted to the people separately and indepenent of the balance of the constitution, so as to get an expression of the popular voice on the subject—even before that provision was adopted, our laws provided that if a negro came into the State, he was required to procure a white man to go his security for good behavior, and in the event of his failing to give the security, he was hired out to service for one year; if at the end of the year he still failed to give it, he was hired out for another year; and so on until he could find some white person to go security for his good behavior, and that he would not become a charge upon the public. Such has been the legislation of my own State from the time she was first admitted into the Union, and I presume it has been the same in other free States. These provisions were rigidly enforced; and now, when I hear that Massachusetts cannot get a trial of the constitutional question involved in that legislation, I will assure the the Senators from that State that, if they come to Illinois, we will furnish all facilities to test the constitutional question. We are willing to have the right tested so far as we are concerned. The trial then can take place between two free States of the Union, where there will be no sectional prejudices, no hostile feelings incited, and where we can have a fair trial upon the constitutional questions involved. We believe that we have a right to pass all those laws that we deem necessary to the quiet and peace of our own community. These laws are passed among us as police regulations; they are executed as such.—There is no difficulty in having a trial there, and an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; and then we can see whether we have this right or not. We believe that we have the right. We border upon slave states on two sides. We do not wish to make our State an asylum for the old and decrepit and broken down negroes that may emigrate or be sent into it. We desire every other State to take care of her own negroes, whether free or slave, and we will take care of ours. That law was adopted for the purpose of preventing other States inundating and colonizing Illinois with free negroes. We do not believe it to be wise and politic to hold out inducements for that class of people to come and live among us. Those who have been born in the State, or who were resident there at the time of the enactment of these laws, are protected in the enjoyment of all their civil rights; but they are not placed upon an equality with the whites. They are not permitted to serve on juries, or in the malitia, or to vote at elections; or to exercise any other political rights. They are recognized as inhabitants, and protected as such in the enjoyment of all their rights of person and property. Whilst we protect those who are there, and their posterity, we do not intend to be inundated by colonies of negroes from other States, sent to us in order to get rid of the trouble of them at home.

It is for this reason that Illinois has adopted this system of legislation, and, having adopted it, we do not desire to insist upon it unless it is consistent with the Constitution of the United States. We are willing to have the question tested. We invite any gentleman who deems it right to oppose these laws to bring his suit. We will furnish him all facilities for having the question decided, and then we shall know whether the right exists or not. I would much have preferred that this question should have arisen between two free States of the Union, where there would have been no prejudices or sectional jealousies, or other improper motives to enter into it to bias our judgments and excite our passions, than to see it arrayed here as one of the sectional questions between the North and the South.

NEGRO MAN SHOT.—We learn that a fugitive slave was shot in this county, yesterday morning, while resisting an attempt made by several white men to effect his capture. It appears that two unknown negroes were seen skulking about the farm of Major Taylor—that an arrangement was made with a negro man in the neighborhood to decoy them into a barn that night. This was done, and a party of white men, Jas. Vanarsdall, Wm. Atkinson, and two others, repaired to the barn about nine o'clock, and commanded the negroes to come down from the loft, where they were secreted, and surrender themselves. No reply was made to this demand, and, as it was thought to be a dangerous undertaking to invade the place of their concealment in the dark, the party concluded to remain on guard all night. About daybreak, one of the negroes hailed the party of white men, and informed them that, as they (the negroes) had been much annoyed during the night, they were now getting out of patience, and were resolved to come down and fight their way through; that war would soon be declared, and that blood-shed might be expected. He informed them, moreover, that, being something of a giant in size and strength, he didn't fear the result, as he had already defeated a party of nine white man, and was disposed to look upon four as hardly a circumstance. With this pleasant bit of bravado, he leaped from his place of concealment, armed with a scythe blade, and commenced the attack, supported in the rear by the other negro, a smaller and less warlike specimen of the wooly-headed race. In the fracas which ensued, the largest negro was shot in the side by J. Vanarsdall, and it is thought that the wound will prove fatal. Both the negroes had escaped, we understand, from Wm. Hoskins, of Garrard county.—*Harradsburg (Ky.) Plowboy, Sept. 25.*

ANOTHER NEGRO SHOT.—We understand that a negro was shot yesterday morning, and killed instantly, by Mr. Theodore H. Davis, of this county. We have not learned the particulars.—*Ib.*

——KIDNAPPING.—Two men, while passing afoot through our Village on Monday morning last, were arrested on suspicion of having stolen or decoyed two mulatto boys they had with them. By examining each one apart from the others, it was found that the boys had been kidnapped from a white woman, whom they call their mother, living in Bedford county, Tennessee, about nine miles from Shelbyville. The boys say they were free, and that their names are ROBERT JACKSON and WILLIAM CARROLL. By order of their captors they assumed other names, and made up a tale to mislead as to their true history and home. Not till after repeated trials and threats could they be induced to give a true account of their capture and travel. Their mother, they say, with her family, consisting of themselves and two white daughters, had been induced by these men to leave her home, and to go to a place near Huntsville, and while there, they were suddenly taken from her, and carried to the railroad, whence they were brought through Augusta, Geo., to this place. The men, on being closely questioned, substantially confirm this statement. They say they live in North Carolina, and that their names are ELIHU KING RECTOR and WILLIAM PAYNE. They were making their way back to North Carolina. Both have been committed to jail. The boys, who are probably about nine and eleven years of age, are in possession of the jailer, though not in custody.—*Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment....Without Compromise.

NEW YORK: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1850.

THE PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTION.

ALMOST every newspaper in the Northern States is full of the excitement caused by the Fugitive Slave Bill, and of the spirit of resistance which it has called forth. Even the most pro-slavery of the political prints are tame in their rebukes of these demonstrations. Their chief game is to throw dust in the eyes of the people, and to delude them into the belief that the law is a dead letter, which can never be carried into effect. If so, of what special use is it as a measure of pacification to the South? Surely, the Slaveholders did not consent to submit to have their foot put afresh upon our necks, after they had frightened us by the threat of taking it off, with the expectation that the condition of their condescension was to be broken at the very outset. Is the Peace on Earth and Good Will to Men (who happen to be white), of the Evangel of which Daniel Webster was the Baptist and Henry Clay the Messiah, to end in this dispair? Verily, we think it is not Peace, but a Sword, that it brought upon the Earth, if this be the true interpretation of it. As indeed it is, and should be, in whatever light it be regarded. It is hostile to the simplest instincts of humanity, and to the faintest sensibilities of freedom, and must, in the nature of things, create a warfare as enduring as itself.

But it is not true that it is a dead letter. The case in this City, of which we gave an account last week, proves how easily the new machine works. It works with the beautiful simplicity of the guillotine. The finger of a child can touch the rod which will bring its ingenious complications into play, and all is over as far as this world is concerned with the victim submitted to its operation. To be sure, in that case, the sympathy which it excited procured the redemption of the miserable man from the hell into which he had been plunged. But that is an accident too happy to be forever happening. And if it were not, would it diminish the keenness of the man-hunter to know that his game will be bought back at his own price, if he can but lay hold of it? We apprehend that the Slaveholders would willingly sell "running" all the slaves that have had sagacity and skill enough to effect their escape, on as easy terms. It is not the actual number of slaves that may be recaptured under this law, though it will be owing to the Anti-Slavery Agitation if it be not reckoned by hundreds, if not thousands; it is the perpetual sense of danger which haunts the fugitive and his friends that constitutes the main wickedness of this new abomination. The sword of Damocles may never fall; but as long as it is suspended by a single hair, it creates a suspense worse than death in the hearts of those over whose heads it hangs.

What is the chief end of civil government but personal security? What distinguishes a civilized from a barbarous society, but the dependence which each member reposes in the protection of all the rest? To be at ease in his professions or of his penury, to have his own happiness and such share of this world's goods as he can secure in his own keeping and at his own disposal, is the great aim of every intelligent member of civil society. Whether he be the master of boundless acres or

"Lord of his presence, and no land beside,"

it is the sense of ownership, if central of all that pertains to him, that makes life sweet and hopeful. Take this away and, though you heap the wealth of Attalus upon him, you take away that which gives all true zest to its enjoyment. It is the difference between a Turkish pacha or a Russian boyard and an Englishman of high or low degree. Our fathers did not so much object to the amount levied upon them by Parliament as to the denial of that prerogative of Britons to be taxed and governed by laws to which he has given his consent. The utter insecurity of the slave is too apparent to need illustration What befel Hamlet may be the fate of any fugitive before sunset. The distress of indignation and pity which such atrocities excite in every honest heart is always at hand. The participation in the perils of the slave, which such indignation and pity must expose every honest man, is imminent and perpetual. There can be no peace until this matter is put at rest.

Now, how is it to work until rest is found for it? Will the Slaveholders forego their rights and suffer there escaped slaves to go unscathed of this new law? Who believes it? Who believes that anything short of a deliberate belief that it would be at the imminent risk of the life of himself or his agent to make the attempt, that would prevent it? Is this belief to be placed on a solid foundation? This remains to be proved. No one, we trust, will be found so base as to deny the right of the slave himself to protect his liberty at the price of his master's life. None, certainly, who admit the rightfulness of taking life for any cause. What motive has he to restrain his hand? He has had no part or lot in the framing of the Constitution or the making of the laws. He is an outcast, an outlaw, an alien. He is remitted to his natural rights; and whatever any human being may do, in defence and vindication of his natural rights, he eminently and above all other men may do. The Norman tyrants could make forest laws and secure to themselves the sole pleasure of the chase; but when antlered stag or tusky boar turned upon them and stood at bay, not all the subtleties of Norman enactments could save them from the deadly thrust. Has the slave not a right to choose between the certainty of a Southern Plantation and the possibility of a Northern Gallows? How can any man, who will fight in any quarrel, withhold his hand from this? It does not require a unanimous population, or even a large majority, to carry on such a revolution as this, even if it come to blows. A Boston minister has preached, and means to publish it, that he is ready to lead or to follow any forcible attempt to rescue a slave. He declares himself ready to supply any fugitive with arms, and to teach him to use them. A few such men set on what we call the Revolution. Not many are required to carry forward this.

These are the things that bring home to men's minds the anomalies of their political estate. It is in vain that they try to wink them out of their own sight and to persuade other people that they are not to be seen. That popular excitation and movement which is the terror of all politicians is only fanned and fed by their vain attempts to quench it. They cry Peace, in vain, for there is no Peace as long as they abide in the tents of wickedness. Uproar, tumult and bloodshed must be ever near, if not always present. For the time is gone by when coffles of slaves could be driven peaceably through the streets of Northern Cities. The lovers of ease must bestir themselves to be rid of the radical cause of the disturbance in the body politic. It would be no unpoetical justice if the same fate which awaits Abolitionists at the South should encounter Slaveholders at the North. If the mobocratic laws and lawless outbreaks of coward Slavery should be re-echoed by answering illegalities, in defence of the fugitives, on the part of as sensitive Liberty. Have the Slaveholders taken out a monopoly of brute force? Are Constitutions and Laws iron links to us and filmy cobwebs to them? These are questions likely to be asked and answered about these times. Whatever be the result, it can hardly fail to produce that effervescence in the popular mind which tyrants and their tools abhor, and which is the certain precursor of political change.

We look upon this Fugitive Bill as a most significant, as well as a most important, event in the history of the Anti-Slavery Revolution. Whence came it? From the degree of protection Anti-Slavery Agitation had thrown around the fugitives whose evasion Anti-Slavery Agitation had promoted. What is its design? To replace this matter where it stood twenty years ago, when escape was comparatively rare, and rendition absolutely easy. What does it prove? That there is less hostility to Slavery than has heretefore existed? Nay, verily; but the direct contrary. Are there not as many Abolitionists as before the Bill passed? Yes, indeed, and their number will multiply faster than ever before. And yet the wire pullers at Washington believe, or pretend that they believe, that they have put this Agitation at rest, and pacified the country! We can tell them that revolutions never go backwards, and that a movement, like ours, aimed at the destruction of an element so closely entwined with our institutions as Slavery, *is* a Revolution. What the present stage of that Revolution may be, cannot be told from a contemporary stand-point. But the time is not very remote when this imagined victory of the Slave Power will be seen as certain sign of its weakness, and a sure forerunner of its downfall.—E. Q.

"ALL MEN ARE BORN FREE & EQUAL!"
THE HOME OF THE OPPRESSED OF ALL NATIONS
A DAY, AN HOUR OF VIRTUOUS LIBERTY IS WORTH AN AGE OF SERVITUDE
Am I not a man and a Brother?
HAIL COLUMBIA HAPPY LAND!

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.....HAMLET IN CHAINS.

IT is not one of the least significant indications of which way the popular current is setting that such a print as this which we here lay before the readers of the *Standard* should have been first presented to the world in the columns of a New York Sunday newspaper. The *Sunday Atlas*, presenting, no less in the ability with which it is conducted than in the moral tone, especially on the Slavery question, by which it is distinguished, a striking contrast to the newspapers of its class, has either the boldness to direct the opinion of its public, or else is reckoning upon a public opinion which, did we judge from the tone of the press generally, does not exist in this city. We believe both in the boldness and the sagacity of the *Atlas*. It will direct a sentiment which it is wise enough to see is not altogether wanting in the mercenary population of this New Orleans of the North.

The engraving tells its own story. It is intended to commemorate the outrage upon Liberty and Humanity which, in the name of the law, was perpetrated in this city, within the walls of its Civic Hall, over which floats, daily, the 'fustian flag' of the Union, and on whose dome stands, as the presiding genius of the place, the figure of Justice with her even scales. This is not the first cowardly, despotic act of the same character that has been done within that same building; but it is the first which Northern people have seemed to recognize in its true character; and to cry out against, with a universal voice, as an outrage, the repetition of which, if there be a spark of manliness or love of freedom left in our bosoms, should not be tolerated.

The case of Hamlet we need not again review. Its details are familiar to all our readers, and all know how strictly in accordance with the new law was his abduction, and how contrary was it also to every recognized rule of right, whether Christian, or legal according to common law. His chained and upraised arms and imploring look to Heaven, though turned from the multitude behind him, as they might in truth have been that day, may yet find an answer in the Northern heart to their mute appeal.

THE HUNT.

IF the wily politicians at Washington, who assured the country that the vexed question of Slavery was at length settled, meant a settlement whereby the extinction of the system should be foretold and pre-doomed, they would have been far nearer the truth than in the assertion, that the agitation of the subject was at length suppressed. If the leaders of both parties in House and Senate, had asked a special meeting of conference with the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, for the purpose of availing themselves of its experience, and uniting with it in some method of arousing the popular heart of the North from its torpidity, their united wisdom could have hit upon no measure more certain to accomplish the end proposed than the passage of the new Fugitive Slave Law. The extension of Slavery into new Territories was submitted to by many, because it was hoped a Tariff would be given as an equivalent; by others, because the evil was a great way off, and more affecting the future than the present; by others still who feared the consequences of further agitation of the subject; by still more, because they saw no alternative but submission; and the very few did it seem any thing else than the settlement of an abstract question, fruitful, if not settled, of great evils. But the Fugitive Law brought the matter home to the very doors of the Northern people. Almost everybody has seen a fugitive slave; in almost every community there are more or less of these unfortunate persons living quietly and peaceably upon the fruits of their own labor, thankful for the privilege of being let alone. Their very presence is an appeal, not to be resisted, to every humane man. The proposal to tear them from their homes, and drag them back to bondage, is an insult to Northern hospitality and humanity; to threaten fine and imprisonment for open or overt interference with such an outrage, is an insult to the manhood and spirit of independence, which, thank God, even constitutional obligation and the habit of obedience to the slave power have not yet altogether obliterated from the Northern character. The growth of Northern Anti-Slavery sentiment has just reached that point when some just such measure as this would fill to overflowing the measure of Northern forbearance and toleration. In the inevitable progress of events, this infamous law comes to bring to a head the latent but intense feeling which the labors of Abolitionists have been for years creating. The cunning schemers were not at fault in their calculation of how much submission they might rely upon in an invasion of the political rights of the North; but they got far beyond their depth, when they ventured to include in their reckoning the sense of moral obligation in the Northern people.

They begin now, however, to learn their mistake. The *Journal of Commerce* in this city, the *Boston Courier* in Boston, and other slave-catchers' organs in other places, are fairly in amaze and consternation at the excitement created throughout the country. They cannot permit a day to pass without deprecating so much stir about so trifling a matter, and are continually reminding the people of their constitutional duties. Their strongest argument in favor of the law, and one which they think is overwhelmingly triumphant, is that it is no worse than that of 1793—a course of reasoning which leads us to suspect that these journals mean to advocate next the re-establishment of Slavery in the Northern States, and the repeal of all laws against the Foreign Slave Trade. Indeed the re-establishment of a great many excellent old institutions could be secured, if it be taken for granted that a thing is good now, if it be just the same as it was a half century ago.

They have good reason to deprecate public excitement on this subject who fear it, for it far exceeds anything that has ever occurred before. We will give some of the Resolutions passed in different places, as an indication of the popular feeling.

At the great meeting in Syracuse, alluded to in our last number, the following resolutions were adopted:

1. Resolved, That whenever the legislators of a democratic government have seriously encroachment upon the constitutional or natural rights of the people, it is not only the prerogative, but the duty of their constituents, to remonstrate with, and reprove them.

2. Resolved, That "the Fugitive Slave Law," recently enacted by the Congress of these United States, is a most flagrant outrage upon the inalienable rights of man; and a daring assault upon the Palladium of American liberties, OUR CONSTITUTION.

3. Resolved, That every intelligent man and woman, throughout our country, ought to read attentively, and understand the provisions of this law in all its details; so that they may be fully aware of its diabolical spirit, and cruel ingenuity, and prepare themselves to oppose all attempts to enforce it.

4. Resolved, that in striking down, as the makers of this law fain would do, at a blow, the right of trial by Jury, and of habeas corpus, the right of appeal and the privilege of counsel, they have attempted to obliterate life marks of progress in the civil history of the world, and to bring back the dark ages of Despotism and Absolute Rule, against which the Constitution of these United States meant effectually to guard, by its explicit and solemn guaranty of these inestimable rights.

5. Resolved, That inasmuch as several of the distinctive provisions of this Fugitive Slave Law, are clearly, indisputably unconstitutional, the enactment of it is utterly null and void, and should be so accounted and treated by the people. A citizen cannot be held by it, in disregard of the fundamental law of the Republic; and must be sustained by an intelligent Court in opposing every attempt to enforce this law, summarily, and without "*due process.*"

6. Resolved, That we are summoned to withstand the execution of this law, not only by the highest consideration of the claims of suffering fellow beings upon our sympathy and aid, but by a proper regard to our own personal safety. As Slaveholders are no respecters of complexion, there can be no security that their arrests, under this law, might not fall upon some descendants of the Anglo-Saxon race, as well as of the African.

7. Resolved, that the enactment of this infamous law, should cover with reproach the men who advocated it, and, not less than them, the men who basely sneaked away from their places in Congress, rather than meet their responsibility as representatives of the people.

8. Resolved, that we feel no little respect for those members of the United States Senate, and House of Representatives who have resolutely withstood the encroachments of slavery, and have recorded their votes in opposition to this Fugitive Slave Law. They have shown themselves to be the true friends of our Country, and if she shall fall, as other Republics have done, into the hands of oppressors and tyrants, they will have the satisfaction of knowing, that they did what they could to arrest her ruin.

9. Resolved, That to none in all our country, should be attributed the passage of this most wicked law, so much as to Daniel Webster; and that hereafter he cannot be called the Defender of the Constitution, except in *bitter irony.*

10. Resolved, that there never has been in the whole course of the legislation of our Republic, a case in which it was so plainly the duty of the President to interpose his veto, to prevent the enactment of an unconstitutional law, as in this case. And we deeply regret that the present Chief Magistrate did not feel it to be his duty to exercise this power.

11. Resolved that the friends of freedom and humanity ought to agitate more than ever the question which this law was devised to settle. Let the country be rocked by discussion from centre to circumference until every one who has a heart may be aroused to enquire what is his or her duty, and fired with the determination to do it.

12. Resolved, That a Committee of three be appointed by the Chair, to prepare, and cause to be circulated, a petition to be presented to our next Congress, signed by hundreds of thousands, praying for the immediate repeal of this infamous law.

13. Resolved, That we recommend the appointment of a Vigilance Committee of 13 citizens, whose duty it shall be to see that no person is deprived of his liberty without due process of law: and all good citizens are earnestly recommended to aid and sustain them in all needful efforts for the security of all persons claiming the protection of our laws.

At Oswego Resolutions of a similar character have been passed at a public meeting of the citizens. We copy them also:

1. Resolved, That love of Liberty is among the noblest and loftiest principles planted by the God of nature in the heart of man, and that, therefore, the late Fugitive Slave Law, which undertakes to brand its high boon and inextinguishable impulses as a crime, and the fugitive from bondage as a felon—which assumes to repeal the law of Christian love, by prohibiting us from furnishing him food and fire and shelter in his pilgrimage to an asylum,—which enacts that our sympathies for the oppressed shall be suffocated, and the instincts of our common nature extinguished,—aims a blow no less deadly at the noblest principles of the human heart, and the cardinal virtues of religion, than at the outlawed and defenceless victims whom it seeks to re-enslave; and as we would be loyal to the God who reigns above us, and to the divinity that stirs within us, we must trample under foot its inhuman and ungodly enactments.

2. Resolved, That our oaths to support the Federal Constitution, no less than our higher and holier obligations to be true to the Constitution of our common humanity, and obedience to the laws of God, require that we should set at naught an enactment which recklessly assumes to suspend the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, and wickedly to abridge the free exercise of the vital principles of religion—rights sacredly and jealously guarded and guarantied, as well by the letter of the Constitution, as by the spirit of the age which gave it birth.

3. Resolved, That the recent case in New York, in which a colored man was decoyed into a Commissioner's, office, and there charged with being a fugitive slaves, and after a brief examination of the persons claiming him, without the privilege of offering rebutting testimony, without the advice of counsel as to what plea he should make to establish his right to freedom, without time being allowed for the arrival of the counsel sent for, was handed over to the claimant as a slave, proves that colored, if not white men, are unsafe in the free States, no matter how free nor how respectable they may be.

4. Resolved, That as "the Law presumes every man to be innocent until he is proven guilty," so should persons claimed as slaves be presumed to be free men, until the contrary is established by an impartial trial by jury in which both both parties should be allowed a full and fair hearing. The claims should show, beyond all doubt, that the person claimed *is his property*, and if he commits perjury, he should be punished therefore in the same manner as those who testify falsely in other cases.

5. Resolved, That while we have every disposition to adhere to and carry out the provisions of the Constitution, we can sanction no such atrocious measure as the Fugitive Slave Law, which tramples in the dust that sacred instrument, as well as the dearest rights of freemen. Therefore,

6. Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the chair, to prepare, and cause to be circulated, a petition to be presented to our next Congress, signed by every freeman praying for the immediate repeal of this infamous law.

7. Resolved, That the friends of freedom and humanity ought to agitate more than ever the question which this law was devised to settle. Let the country be rocked by discussion from centre to circumference, until, every one who has a heart may be aroused to inquire what is his or her duty, and fired with the determination to do it.

8. Resolved, That we solemnly forewarn all who, under color of office or otherwise, assume to enforce this staute, by acting as the slaveholder's blood-hounds in hunting down or arresting the panting fugitive, or returning him to the bondage from which he may have escaped, will be arraigned at the dread tribunal of public opinion, and if found guilty, be adjudged unworthy of any public office of honor, profit to trust within the gift of a Free People.

9. Resolved, That we recommend the appointment of a Vigilance Committe of 13 citizens, whose duty it shall be to see that no person is deprived of his liberty without due process of law, and all good citizens are earnestly recommended to aid and sustain them in all needful efforts for the security of all persons claiming the protection of our laws.

At the Springfield Meeting the Resolutions show a no less determined spirit. They were as follows:

Resolved, That "resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

Resolved, That we know of no tyranny more galling, nor oppression more degrading, than that law which would change a man to a thing.

Resolved, That it is the inalienable right and solemn duty of all men oppressed by such a law, to emancipate themselves. Therefore, those who have accomplished this great object for themselves and children, are worthy of all honor, of the sympathy, kind regards and protection of all true lovers of liberty.

Resolved, That that portion of our population who have escaped from the house of bondage, have by their own act, in the providence of God, become free and independent, and have a right to dwell with us upon free soil.

Resolved, That whereas *they* never were a party to that compact which provides for delivering up fugitives from Slavery, therefore they are justified in using such means for the protection of themselves and famalies as God and Nature have given them.

Resolved, That we hold in utter abhorrence the recent act of Congress known as the Fugitive Slave Bill—that it shall have no effect to shut up our bowels of compassion toward the fugitive, but we will aid and shelter him as heretofore.

Resolved, That the sacred writ of *habeas corpus* is suspended by this act, but that we have moral and legal means sufficient to render it inoperative, and will do all in our power to destroy it.

Resolved, That while we abhor the conduct of the men who passed it, we hold in utter detestation the men who may dare to accept an office or act under it.

Resolved, That we here pledge ourselves to our fellow-citizens to stand by each other in determined resistance to this law, and to fugitives from the South to protect them from their pursuers, and we will if necessary, suffer the consequences.

A Vigilance Committee of 15 and a Finance Comittee of 5 were appointed,

Voted, That alarm be given by ringing of the bells whenever an attempt may be made to arrest a fugitive.

The Resolutions of a meeting at New Bedford breathed the same spirit of resistance to the law, and were so unequivocal on this point that our friend Daniel Ricketson felt constrained, as a non-resistant, to decline giving them the sanction of his name.

We could not, of course, publish the proceedings, or even the Resolutions, of half the meetings that are held, even were they all sent to us; but the above are fair specimens of their general character, so far as we have observed, and indicate very clearly the estimation in which the new law is held. Besides the meetings referred to, others have been held, equally large, equally spirited, and equally the spontaneous expression of public sentiment in Albany, Auburn, Buffalo, Brooklyn, Williamsburg; in Boston, Hingham and Lynn, Mass.; in Norristown and Montrose, Pa., and in various other places in different sections of the country; and meetings of another character are also taking up the matter which brings into conflict with the State a power to which, in such a contest, the State must inevitably succumb. The New York Evangelical Congregational Association passed the following Resolutions, at a meeting at Poughkeepsie, on the 8th inst.:

Resolved, That we cannot recognize this law as of any binding force upon the citizens of our country, 1st. Because it is contrary to the express command of God. Deut. 23: 16, 17—"Thou shall not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." 2d. It is in opposition to the great law of Christian benevolence, which requires us in all things to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. 3d. It conflicts with the provisions of our National Constitution. 4th. It prostrates those two great safeguards of human liberty, *habeas corpus* and trial by jury. 5th. It is revolting to the spontaneous promptings of humanity. 6th. It brings upon our Nation the reproach of injustice and inconsistency, and impairs our influence upon the world for good. 7th. In short, this law

outrages every principle of human feeling of humanity and religion; and thus, so far as the principle is concerned, it endangers the liberty of every man.

Resolved, That while we recognize the obligation to obey the laws of the land, we make an exception in the case of all such provisions as contravene the "higher law" of God.

Resolved, That we advise all persons to render every needful aid and comfort to Fugitive Slaves, just the same as if there were no law in the land forbidding it.

And at an informal meeting of the Delegates to the New York State Baptist Convention, held at Blockport, on the 9th and 10th, the Preamble and Resolutions following were unanimously adopted;

Whereas, the said law is manifestly a receding step in the cause of human liberty and enlightened human legislation, inasmuch as it deprives the colored inhabitants of the Free States of the two great bulwarks of personal safety, the benefit of the "Habeas Corpus," and the "Right of Trial by Jury;" and whereas it lays the citizens of said States under *legal* obligations to assist the slaveholder and the slave-hunter in a business against which their moral sense and their best sympathies revolt with instinctive and unutterable aversion; and whereas the said law is oppressive in its bearing, and disastrous in its results to multitudes of those whom we have learned to respect and love as American citizens and as Christians, whose only crime is, that they have availed themselves of the opportunity which the Providence of God has opened to them, of appropriating and enjoying that boon which of all we most highly prize, and which is as much their birthright as our own, therefore—

Resolved, That as free citizens of the United States, and as lovers of equal rights, we *repudiate* the said law as contrary to the spirit of our glorious Declaration of National Independence, and as opposed to the direct grants of the Constitution to every citizen, and to the law of God.

Resolved, That we will not voluntarily aid by any means whatever, in giving effectiveness to this unjust and oppressive act of legislation.

Resolved, That in all suitable ways we will labor to secure a speedy repeal of the said "Fugitive Slave Law;" and that until such repeal shall have been effected, we will in all suitable ways, express our sympathies with its oppressed subjects.

GIBBON WILLIAMS, Chairman.
J. B. Olcott, Secretary.

In the meantime how goes the National sport? In Lowell, Mass. some hunters were on the ground in search of a Mr. Booth, for several years a resident of that city. He had, however, gone to Canada, where his friends advised him to remain, though the *Lowell American* thinks "there are MEN enough in Lowell who believe in the 'higher law' to protect him against all the efforts of the man stealers"

At the latest accounts from Detroit the fugitive mentioned in our last was still in jail, and the jail under the protection of the military. A large public meeting had been held at which the Mayor presided, and distinguished men of both parties were the speakers. If the the case is settled at all without bloodshed, it will be probably by the purchase of the prisoner.

A dispatch from Honesdale, Pa, says that Mrs. Evans the "beautiful creole," has been smuggled off to Canada.

In Boston, it is said, a large number of families have been broken up, at a sacrifice not only of property, but of the dearest social ties in some cases. Their members have left the country in anticipation of pursuit.

As a proof of what sort of means are resorted to to discover and arrest fugitives, see the following dispatch which a Boston paper publishes as received by Marshal Tukey of that city:

"ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

"Stop the thieves. Stolen, a large lot of clothing, $100 in cash, and a silver watch. Runaway from Edward W. Duval, living in Bladensburg, Prince George's county, Maryland, two negro men, aged between 21 and 25 years—one about 5 feet 4 inches high, dark color, grim countenance; one a copper color, 5 feet 4 or 6 inches high, likely in appearance. They were seen on the 28th of September, going over the Columbia Bridge, in Pennsylvania, in company with a mulatto supposed to be free."

We hear of attempts at arrests and escapes also at Hartford, Ct.

Fugitives from further South pass through this city by scores every week. While we are writing, we hear of a woman with six young children, arrived to-day, on their way Northward to join the husband and father, who, being in greater danger, had preceded them Unfortunately the means to assist these poor creatures are very limited and sometimes wholly wanting. Doubtless, there are many who would be glad to spare from their abundance to assist in such cases. We shall be glad to receive donations for that purpose, and will attend to their judicious application.

Such is the Chronicle of Slave-Hunting for the week.

JUDGE JAY ON THE BLOODHOUND BILL.

The following letter from Judge Jay appeared in the *Evening Post* of this city a few days since. We copy it at the request of one of the gentlemen to whom it was addressed, though without that request we should not have permitted a paper so characteristic of its author, and so worthy of the widest circulation, to escape our notice. No clearer exposition of the infamous law which may, at any time, make any of us a slave-hunter or a slave, has yet been offered:

BEDFORD, 2d October, 1850.

Gentlemen: In pursuance of instructions given you by a meeting of colored citizens, you ask me, in your letter of the 27th ult., my opinion, first, "of the constitutionality and binding force" of the late act of Congress for the seizure of fugitive slaves; and, secondly, of the course most proper to be pursued by our colored citizens in reference to the personal jeopardy in which they are now placed.

Many years since I endeavored to prove, in an argument published at the time, that Congress has no constitutional power to pass any law whatever respecting fugitive slaves. I find from Mr. Webster's speech of 7th of last March, that such is also his opinion. But the Supreme Court has otherwise determined, and hence Mr. Webster advised the Senate to exercise power which the Constitution, in his judgment, had conferred exclusively on the States. The law in question appears to me as palpable a violation of the Constitution, as it certainly is of the principles of justice, the rights of humanity, and the obligations of the religion of Jesus Christ.

Of the "binding force" of this law, in its practical operation, I entertain no doubt. It is said, I know, that it is too atrocious to be executed, that public opinion will not endure its enormities. Be not deceived. There was indeed a time when such a law would not have been thought of, much less enforced at the North. Some years since, as I was directing a fugitive as to the route to Canada, he told me, to my surprise, that he wished to go to Massachusetts. On asking him why, he said he had heard Mr. Adams say at Washington, that if a slave once got into Massachusetts, there were not twelve men in the State who would give him up. Little did Mr. Adams anticipate the recent developements of Boston gentility and Andover divinity! The slave-catching law is a boon granted by the North, not a measure fastened upon us by the slaveholders. It is a law passed through Massachusetts's influence, voted for by the Representative from Boston (!!) and approved and applauded by a very large number of politicians. A presidential election is approaching, and the result will be decided by Southern votes. Hence our politicians will seek to propitiate the slaveholders by zeal and diligence in slave-hunting. The law will be executed in all the plenitude of its diabolism, or, to use the words of Mr. Webster, when pledging his support to the bill, then before the Senate, "to the fullest extent—to the fullest extent."

If you ask my opinion, of the "binding force" of this law, in a *moral sense*, I answer that its binding force is precisely the same as was that of the law of Nebuchadnezzar, commanding the multitudes on the plain of Dura to fall down and worship his golden image—of the decree of Darius, forbidding prayer to God for thirty days—of the order of the Jewish magistrates to Peter and Paul "not to speak at all, nor to teach in the name of Jesus"—of the commands of the Roman Emperors, that Christians should cast incense on the altars of idols—of the edicts of Louis XIV., requiring Huguenots to embrace the faith and practice the rites of the Church of Rome. This accursed statute requires us to become *active* instruments of treachery, cruelty and oppression to the persecuted but innocent fugitive—to set at naught the law of Jehovah, to do justice and love mercy—to trample under foot the great commandment of our blessed Redeemer, to love our neighbor, and, regardless of his authority, to do to others what would fill our souls with anguish if done to ourselves. Let us, with our families, enter the dungeons which Northern politicians have prepared, rather than hazard our souls by rendering obedience to the requirements of this wicked law.

Most deeply do I sympathize with you in your unhappy state. With your wives and children, you are now placed at the disposal of any villain who is ready to perjure himself for the price you will bring in the human shambles of the South. With less ceremony and trouble than a man can impound his neighbor's ox, you may be metamorphosed from a citizen of the State of New York, to a beast of burden on a Southern plantation. On leaving your house in the morning, you may be enticed into another, where one of the newly appointed Commissioners, after reading one affidavit made a thousand miles off, and another that you are the person named in the first, or on the bare oath of the kidnapper himself, may inform you to your amazement and horror, that you are a SLAVE. The fetters previously prepared are placed on your limbs, and in a few minutes you are travelling with railroad velocity to a Southern market. Never again will you ever behold your wife and children, nor will any tidings from them ever reach your ear. The remainder of your life is to be one of toil and stripes. In this war against human rights, "the law's delay" is utterly unknown.

The Commissioner is commanded to despatch the affair "IN A SUMMARY MANNER." The oath of the wretch who has seized you, and who expects to clear eight hundred or a thousand dollars by your sale, is of itself all sufficient and abundant proof that you are his property, while your own oath to the contrary is excluded by law The act gives you no right to demand a postponement of the hearing, allows you no process to command the attendance of witnesses, no time to send for counsel. However essential these privileges may be to your restoration of to freedom, to family, to happiness, you must beg them as *favors* to be grated or denied at pleasure, from a creature who has accepted the office of a slave-catching judge, and who is to be paid ten dollars if he doouts you to Slavery, but only *five* if he sets you at liberty! And who is this Commissioner? Heretofore he was a person appointed by the United States Courts to perform certain acts, as taking affidavits, &c. *Now* he is elevated to the office and dignity of a JUDGE, and the Courts are expressly commanded "*to enlarge the number of Commisssioners, with a view to afford reasonable facilities in relation to fugitives from labor.*" Hence these Judges are to be appointed for the express and only purpose of catching negroes, and the *amount* and *condition* of their reward, indicate the character of the men who it is expected will accept the infamous office.

From the decision of one of these men, given under the circumstances I have described, there is no appeal to any court in the United States. Yet this man, whose judgment is too sacred to be reviewed, and in whose awful presence the trial by jury, the *habeas corpus*, and all the forms of the common law devised for the protection of liberty, are but as things of nought—this high and might judge, who sits in judgment upon the right to the souls and bodies of immortal beings, made in the image of God, is deemed unworthy to decide on the title to a horse. Such a question is referred to a *higher* court! And how are these omnipotent slave-catching commissioner-judges appointed? No popular vote intests them with their tremendous powers—no President and Senate are responsible for their learning, wisdom and integrity, notwithstanding the constitution entrusts to them the appointment of the federal judges. Among the wonders of the times, is this discovery of judicial generation. By virtue of this new law, judges procreate judges at pleasure, for the convenience of the slaveholders!

Our commissioner-judges are to have a force at their command to mantain their dignity and execute their behests. They are authorized to appoint an unlimited number of slave-catchers, and each of these miscreants is empowered, by law, to roam through the whole extent of the state, executing warrants, seizing alleged slaves, white or black, ordering out the *posse comitatus*, calling the citizens from their employments and commanding them to join in slave hunts. Should any dare to refuse obedience to the satanic mandate, a fine of $1,000 *and* imprisonment for six months will vindicate the insulted authority of the slave-catcher. When the chase is ended, and the MAN is taken, he may be guarded and transported to the slave region, at the expense of the NATIONAL TREASURY. Thus have our doughfaces—whigs and democrats—in taxing their constituents, to give jobs to slave-catchers, and to rivet the fetters of the bondsmen, fallen down in the dust, and licked the very feet of the slaveholders.

You ask me how you shall secure yourselves from the kidnapper? God only knows. May He have mercy on you, for our law-makers have had none. Rumors have reached me, of an intention on the part of our colored citizens to carry arms in self-defence. If I have earned any title to your confidence, may I not ask you to ponder my advice, to abandon such intention? Most freely do I confess my utter ignorance of any system of morals founded by divine authority on the color of a man's skin. Whenever, and for whatever cause, God permits a white man to take life, I believe he equally permits a black man, in similar circumstances, to do the same. Some, I know, maintain that life may never be taken in self-defence, but it is not on this ground that I urge you to abstain from the use of deadly weapons. I implore, I beseech you, not to attempt the life of the kidnapper, first, because his death will not secure your safety, and being therefore unnecessary, it would be morally wrong; and, secondly, because such an act of violence would prove the source of great evil to yourselves, and to your brethren.

The facilities afforded by this law to the kidnapper are so great, the means of converting you in a slave are so plainly prescribed, the physical force furnished him for perpetrating the outrage is so abundant, that the whole villainy will be done "according to law," and under circumstances rendering resistance vain. The fraudulent affidavit will be regularly verified, warrant duly issued, the seizure strictly legal. Hence, should death occur by your resistance, you would in law be deemed guilty of murder, for having slain an officer in the legal discharge of his duty. Think you, that at a time when parties are sacrificing truth and honor for southern votes, and their leaders openly scoffing at the "higher law," that you would be permitted to escape with impunity? There would be a mighty struggle among our politicians who should make the most southern capital out of the slaughter of a slave-cather. The pro-slavery papers of New York and Boston would be seized with a fit of horror and indignation against the blood-thirsty negroes, and of admiration for the patriotism of the departed martyr, and for that lofty devotion to "the compromises of the constitution" which had cost him his life.

The occasion would, moreover, be embraced for rendering new homage to the slaveholders, by urging the forcible expulsion to Africa of all such negroes as unhappily have no masters to take care of them, and control their savage tempers; and not unlikely hints would be thrown out that, before long, self-preservation would require the re-establishment of slavery at the North. Such an act would also furnish an excuse for armed bands of slave-catchers roaming through the country, insulting and terrifying our citizens, and picking up negroes at pleasure; for you will recollect, they may be seized either with or without warrant.—Leave, I beseech you, the pistol and the bowie knife to southern ruffians and their northern mercenaries. That this law will lead to bloodshed, I take it for granted, but let it be the blood of the innocent, not of the guilty. If anything can rouse the torpid conscience of the north, it will be our streets stained with human blood, shed by the slave-catchers.

Most deeply do I feel and deplore the wrongs inflicted upon your race, bond and free, by a people professing to be Christians and republicans, and greatly do I fear that a righteous Providence will make those very wrongs the instruments of his vengeance, by means of the moral leprosy they are spreading through our country. This very slave-catching law has a direct and powerful tendency to beget in our people a reckless contempt for the rights of individuals, a disregard for the usual conservatory forms of legal and judicial proceedings, and a selfish indifference for the claims of humanity

For years, most strenuous efforts, prompted by commercial and political views, were made to deprive the opponents of slavery of their constitutional privileges by lawless violence. The right of petition was suspended—the freedom of debate interrupted—the sanctity of the post office violated—public meetings dispersed—printing-presses destroyed—furious mobs excited—churches sacked—private houses gutted, and even murder perpetrated. All this violation of rights was regarded with complacency by many who had much at stake, so long as abolitionists alone were its victims. But the spirit of aggression thus raised and fostered, is seeking new subjects on which to exercise its power. "Gentlemen of property and standing" are *now* beginning to feel alarmed about socialism, anti-rentism, agrarianism, &c. Hence, of late. we hear much of the importance of *conservatism*, as it is called The political movements of the last few months seem to indicate that our land-lords, and our cotton-lords, and merchant princes, regard an alliance with the aristocracy of the south, as at least in some degree a security against the violation of vested rights, sequestration of rents, oppressive taxation, unequal laws, &c, &c. To the influence of gentlemen of this class, the late slave law owes its passage.

And is it indeed believed. that the rights of the rich will be protected by familiarizing the populace with the practice of injustice and cruelty towards the poor? Will the sight of innocent men seized in our streets, and sent in fetters to till the broad fields of great landowners, increase the reverence felt for land titles? Is it wise to give the people practical lessons in the demolition of all the barriers raised by the common law for the protection of the weak against the strong? Is it true conservatism to obliterate, in the masses, the sense of justice, the feelings of humanity, the distinction between right and wrong? No man looks with more loathing than I do, on the destructive and disorganizing theories of the day; but I have no idea of counteracting them by the extension of human bondage, and the example of ferocious injustice in hunting innocent men and robbing them of all the rights of humanity. The only conservatism to which I look for the protection of my rights and my property, is the inculcation of that "HIGHER LAW," which, with the authority of Deity and the sanctions of the invisible world, says to each individual, high or low, rich or poor, DO JUSTICE, LOVE MERCY—DO TO OTHERS AS YOU WOULD THEY SHOULD DO TO YOU.

But, alas! this law is sneered at by men whose all depends upon its observance. The vindications of property in MAN, which are poured forth from the pulpit, the forum and the press—the maintenence of caste in the church—the apathy with which the oppression of three millions of conntrymen is viewed—the permission given to introduce slavery into our new territories, with a pledge to receive them as slave States—the broken faith of many of those by whom the permission and pledge were given—the contempt expressed for the scruples of conscience, and the horrible iniquity of the fugitive law--are all combining to break down those barriers of justice, humanity, and the fear of God, which, under our popular form of government, can alone stay the flood of spoliation amd anarchy Well may we tremble, lest God should apply to our nation the maxim of his moral government towards individuals "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also resp."

Yours respectfully,
WILLIAM JAY.

Messrs. George T. Downing, Willlam P. Powell.

We have received the following report of a meeting held at New Brighton, Beaver Co., Pa.:

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW TO BE RESISTED AT ALL HAZARDS.

NEW BRIGHTON, Beaver County, Penn., October 10, 1850.

FRIEND GAY: At a meeting of the inhabitants of New Brighton, held in Temperance Hall, Oct. 9, 1850, called to consider the recent Fugitive Slave Law, and the best means to resist its execution, the following resolutions were offered by Henry C. Wright, and, after a full and animated discussion by him and others, were adopted with great unanimity and enthusiasm:

1. *Resolved*, That all slaves owe it as a sacred duty to themselves, to their children, and to their God, to escape from Slavery, by running away, or by such other means as, in their opinion, are right and best adapted to secure to them and to their children their inherent and inalienable right to liberty.

2. *Resolved*, That the man or the woman who, under any pretext whatever, shall refuse to help slaves to escape from Slavery, as opportunity offers, by secreting, harboring and feeding them, and by furnishing means to elude the slave-hunter, he or she should be regarded and *treated* as a *kidnapper*, and as a traitor to God and Humanity.

3. *Resolved*, That any man who, as Judge, Commissioner, Marshal, Deputy Marshal, or assistant, or who in any way, *officially* or *unofficially*, shall aid in or abet the execution of the recent Fugitive Slave Law, is a deadly enemy to the virtue, peace and safety of us and our families, and ought to be regarded and treated as horse thieves, highway robbers, murderers and other high criminals are treated, inasmuch as he prowls about among us as a beast of prey, seeking to consign us and our families to the pollutions and horrors of American Slavery.

4. *Resolved*, That we will do what we can to hold up to the contempt and execration of our children, and of our friends and neighbors, all who, *officially* or *unofficially*, shall aid in carrying out said Fugitive Slave Law, or shall, in any way, be accessory to the capture and return to Slavery any man, woman or child, who shall come to us for protection against slaveholders and their agents.

5. *Resolved*, That those ministers and churches that do not openly and publicly array themselves against said Fugitive Slave Law, to prevent its execution, are not ministers and churches of Christ, but ought to be regarded and treated, by every friend of God and man, as the ministers and synagogues of Satan.

Voted, That Henry C. Wright be a committee to procure the publication of the above Resolutions in the newspapers of this vicinity and elsewhere.

HENRY C. WRIGHT.

THE LOUISVILLE EXAMINER.—The October No. of this paper is announced as its last. Its discontinuance is not because it has not subscribers, but because its subscribers will not pay—no uncommon case, we suspect, among periodicals devoted to reform. There are, it seems, men enough in Kentucky who will read an Anti-Slavery paper, but not enough who are willing to pay for such reading, to support the expense of publication. So the *Examiner* from a weekly became a monthly, and now stops altogether.

We regret this necessity, for the paper was a good one, and must have been effecting good. Its existence was a landmark we do not like to miss, for, even if nothing else, it was no slight thing that a paper, which looked at the Slavery question, for the most part, from the moral side, was printed and edited in a Slave State. But the *Examiner* had other merit than that which mere locality gave it. Its tone was earnest, its standard high, its temper good, and its bearing always manly; and it was never dull and inefficient for lack of editorial ability. It was worthy of a better time and a better fate.

In its valedictory to its readers, it speaks hopefully of the cause. That that is progressive, we have no doubt; but we may assert what the modesty of the *Examiner* forbade it to suggest, that the discontinuance of such a paper is a sad hindrance to that progress. Its languishing existence and its final disappearance, are a reproach, and at the same time an answer to that large class of persons at the North who oppose the Anti-Slavery agitation here because, they assert, its legitimate place is only in the Southern States. If it ought to be carried on there, why did not such men support the *Examiner*? If it can be carried on there, why did not such a paper flourish even without their support?

☞ WE have received from Wm. Harned, 61 John street, a pamphlet of 36 pages, which we hope will be widely circulated all over the country. It is a complete history of the new Fugitive Law, containing the Bill itself, an analysis of the vote upon it, a statement of all the proceedings in the first case under it—that of Hamlet—and also an argument on the unconstitutionality of the Law, and a report of the meetings of the colored people in this city. It is a most useful and opportune publication, and, that it may be scattered every where, is sold at the low price of $2 per hundred, or five cents apiece. We will attend to any orders that may be sent to this office.

Notes on New Books.

ÆSOP'S FABLES: *A new Version, chiefly from original sources. By Rev. Thomas James, M. A. Vicar of Sibberloft and Theddingsworth. With illustrations. New York: Robert B. Collins, No. 254 Pearl street.*

There are a few books in the world familiar alike to the most learned and the most illiterate, valuable alike to both, worth sometimes to the first all their love, and making the last sometimes wiser than those studious of much learning. Æsop is one of these. The name of the Phrygian Slave is a household word among the humblest, and the wise and the great do not disdain to accept him as their teacher, though they may not always profit by the lesson. The young learn truth from his Fables, and the hoary head does not forget his wisdom. His teachings point our daily talk, and pervade the highest literature. Two hundred years after his death the Athenians erected a statue to his memory, placing it in front of those of the seven Sages; the moderns, more than two thousand years later, make of him, in books, as enduring a memorial.

Æsop, himself, probably never wrote a word; his teachings were oral, and repeated from mouth to mouth, and from generation to generation Much that he said has no doubt been lost, and much that he never said attributed to him. Of the quality of what he did say and is lost, we may judge by that which is left, and the value of that which is put into his mouth is proved by the fact that it has been handed down as his. If all the Fables which are called his are not so, they are, at any rate, the production of minds of the highest character.

The collection of the Rev Mr. James is made from those Fables known as Æsop's in the best period of Greek literature, and purports to be more authentic than any hitherto published in English. They commend themselves to the reader by the appropriate simplicity and elegance af the language in which they are clothed, and the further recommendation of being left, for the most part, to tell their own moral; when that appendage is added, it is as brief and as proverbial as possible. This volume has another merit—that of being one of the handsomest ever issued from the American press. The style in which it is printed, the typography, and the paper are fully equal to the best of London books; and its illustrations—by Fenniel—while admirable in design, and stories in themselves, are each of them very fine specimens of the perfection to which the art of wood-engraving has been brought. The most fastidious lover of beautiful books could find no fault with this volume. It is no less pleasant to look at than it is profitable to read.

SONGS OF LABOR, AND OTHER POEMS. *By John G. Whittier. Boston: Ticknor, Reed & Fields.*

Mr. Whittier's friends and admirers may claim one good quality for him, which, we imagine, the most carping critic will not dispute. He is the most industrious poet living, if we may judge from the frequency with which his volumes are announced. We have not been so fortunate as to see them all, and are not able to say, therefore, how many of them are merely new collections of old materials; we believe, nevertheless, the remark will hold good, that, in quantity, he is the first of living—certainly of American—poets.

We should be sorry, however, to suggest any invidious comparison. It does not detract from his merit as a writer, that he writes a good deal; and that his popularity—a good test of his quality—is not only unabated but increasing, is proved by the fact, that he writes so much. His audience, within the last few years, has been greatly enlarged, and he is acquiring fame now by the very poems, and character of poetry, which, not a great while ago, were sure to keep him in obscurity, or to attract attention to him only as one deserving of nothing better than infamy. Some of his Anti-Slavery lyrics, which, in the earlier days of the cause, when Whittier was one of its most honored leaders, were only the rendering in stirring rhyme what others said in plainer prose, and for which they were turned over to the tender mercies of the mob—such poems now make the staple quotations of politicians, who want to point a paragraph, or cap a climax.

Progress—the remark is common enough to be true—is the order of the day. However unpopular the reforms going on around us, and which men are every where striving for, may seem to be, and in reality are, with the mass, it is only with the unthinking mass that they are so. There are reflecting men who are eminently conservative, but they are the exceptions in the conservative party. The reformers are not only reasonable, but are all reasoning men, else would they not be reformers; and they constitute the great majority who do any thinking whatever. They are emphatically the men of the present, and are moulding the age into a newer and better form, that the future may be made better still by those who are to live in it. They are not, perhaps, always far-seeing men, or they would strive not only to make to-day better than yesterday, but also what better prophets hope to-morrow will be. But they are entirely earnest in to-day's work, and perfectly understand what they are about, and its immediate results. Whittier is the poet of this class. He has grown up with it, and keeps up with it, not always, or generally, in the van, but in the centre with the main body, where he is easily seen, and always recognized. Even in that cause in which he was once in advance, he has tarried till the multitude came up with him. Now he is popular, because he echoes the popular thought, and does not go beyond it. He is impelled constantly to activity from without, and, therefore, he is so often heard. Were the impulse from within, he would speak less frequently, though it might be higher words, but then he would not speak to his fellows. We must accept him for what he is—the poet of to-day.

The Songs of Labor are familiar to the readers of the current literature, and are among the best and most popular of his poems. They come from one who has worked with his own hands with hammer and lap-stone, and stir the blood of a people, by whom all labor is honored, and whose whole country is one great workshop. The other poems in the volume are, some of them, new, but most of them have already received the stamp of popular favor.

The work is got up in the elegant style which distinguishes everything from the press of Ticknor & Co., and will be welcome to the wide circle of the poet's friends. It is for sale at Francis', this city.

Miscellaneous.

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WESTERN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

TUESDAY. September 17th, 1850.

The Western Anti-Slavery Society convened, according to appointment, in Friends' meeting-house in Salem The President, TRUMAN CASE, of Randolph, presided, and opened the proceedings by a few pertinent and forcible remarks.

Oliver Johnson, the Recording Secretary, nominated as his Assistants ANN ELIZA LEE, of Randolph, and JOHN W. NEWPORT, of Colrain, and they were appointed to that service.

The following Committees were appointed:

Business Committee—Oliver Johnson, Parker Pillsbury, Lydia Irish, Samuel Myers, Rachel W. Whinry, Oliver Brown, Eliza T. Heacock, Wm. E. Lukens, Kersey G. Thomas, Cordelia Smalley. [To these were subsequently added, J. Elizabeth Jones and Maria L. Giddings.]

Committee to Nominate Officers—James Barnaby, Ellen Thomas, George Garretson, Harvey M. Case, Oliver Johnson, Mary Whiting.

Finance Committee—Samuel Brooke, Sarah McMillan, Cordelia Wadsworth, T. E. Vickers.

Samuel Brooke, during the absence of the Business Committee, presented two resolutions, on which he made some remarks.

The resolutions were afterwards laid on the table, to afford opportunity to hear the report of the Business Committee.

The Business Committee, through Parker Pillsbury, presented the series of resolutions hereunto annexed, and numbered 1 to 9 inclusive, and which it was voted to consider separately. Remarks were made upon the first resolution by B. S. Jones, P. Pillsbury, Oliver Brown, and H. C. Wright.

It was voted that the morning sessions commence at 10 o'clock and close at half past 12, and that the afternoon sessions commence at 2 o'clock.

Oliver Johnson read a letter from James N. Buffum, of Lynn, Mass., which was directed to be published with the proceedings of the Society.

TUESDAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

2 *o'clock, P. M*—The President not being present, Oliver Johnson was appointed President pro tem. The President, however, soon came in and resumed the chair.

The first resolution of the series offered by the Business Committee was taken up and discussed by Parker Pillsbury, H. C. Wright, ——— McDuffee, and A. K. Foster, and unanimously adopted.

The Society of Friends wishing to occupy their house to-morrow forenoon, the Society voted to hold its next session in a grove. Adjourned.

WEDNESDAY—FORENOON SESSION.

10 *o'clock, A. M., Sept.* 18—In the absence of the President, David L. Galbreath was appointed President pro tem. The resolutions offered yesterday by Samuel Brooke, were taken up and discussed by Samuel Brooke, Truman Case, Oliver Johnson and Samuel Myers, and unanimously adopted.

H. C. Wright offered a series of resolutions, which he supported at some length.

Adjourned to meet at Friends' meeting-house at 2 o'clock, P. M,

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Annual Report of the Executive Committee was read by Oliver Johnson, and accepted.

The report of the Treasurer was also read and accepted.

Remarks on the Annual Report and the condition of the Society's affairs were made by M. R. Robinson, B. S. Jones, James Barnaby, Enos Hillis, Abby K. Foster, Oliver Johnson, Samuel Brooke, and Parker Pillsbury, and pending a motion that the Annual Report be approved by the Society, adjourned till to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY—FORENOON SESSION.

H. C. Wright made some remarks upon the resolutions offered by him yesterday, after which they were referred to the Business Committee.

The Committee on nominations made their report, and the officers of the Society for the ensuing year were elected as follows:

President—MARIUS R. ROBINSON, Marlboro.

Vice Presidents—WILLIAM WATSON, Lowellville; TRUMAN CASE, Randolph; JACOB MILLISACK, Leesburgh; THOMAS CHANDLER, Michigan; JONATHAN HUDDLESTON, Indiana; BENJAMIN BOWNE, Pennsylvania; A. W. RAWSON, Illinois; CALEB GREEN, Southington.

Corresponding Secretary--OLIVER JOHNSON, Salem.

Recording Secretary—HARVEY D. SMALLEY, Randolph.

Treasurer—ISAAC TRESCOTT, Salem.

Executive Committee—James Barnaby, Lydia Irish, John Gordon, J. Elizabeth Jones, Marius R. Robinson, Sarah McMillan, Kerrey G. Thomas, Eliza T. Heacock, Mary Griffith, Lot Holmes, H. D. Smalley, Laura Barnaby, Wm. E. Lukens, Isaac Trescott, William Griffith, Robert Hillis.

The consideration of the Annual Report and the financial condition of the Society was resumed. Remarks were made by O. Johnson, ——— Hosington, A. K. Foster and others. Barclay Gilbert, of Atwater, (a Free Soil man) expressed his interest in the Society as a means of moral agitation, and spoke plainly of the backwardness of its members in making contributions. He offered to be one of a hundred individuals who would pledge themselves to pay $5 each, during the year.—This proposition was warmly responded to, one hundred and thirty-three individuals uniting in it, thus securing to the treasury the sum of $615,00. Pledges for sums less than $5 were then received, amounting to $171,00. John Selby of Mercer Co., Pa., made a pledge of $50,00. These sums added to the collections and pledges received yesterday make the whole amount secured, $904,71 Of this $136,71 was paid down. The scene presented by the meeting while these pledges and collections were being made, was of deep and thrilling interest. Matilda Cunningham, a redeemed slave, made a few remarks, which moved every heart, and then contributed hereself $5,00. Her bodily energies had been worn out by the long endurance of the ills of Slavery, so that she could hardly earn her living, but she was willing to part with her last penny for the cause.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The motion to approve of the Annual Report and of the doings of the Executive Committee, was put and carried.

Kersey G. Thomas and C. S. S. Griffing were appointed to audit the Treasurer's account, and they subsequently reported that they had found it correct. The report was accepted.

The resolutions from the Business Committee were then taken up, when brief addresses were made by M. R. Robinson, A. K. Foster, Samuel Myers, and Oliver Johnson.

The following pledge was presented by Samuel Brooke, and all who were willing to adopt it, were invited to hold up their hands. A considerable number responded, and afterwards signed the pledge.

"We whose names are hereunto attached will, within three months, forward to the Publishing Agent of the Bugle one subscriber whom we warrant to pay, or in place thereof we will become responsible for $1,50."

Parker Pillsbury then made a most impressive parting address, when *all* the remaining resolutions were unanimously adopted by a rising vote, and the meeting adjourned *sine die*.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. *Resolved*, That the Anti-Slavery Enterprise is based on the self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable right to Liberty—and consequently that Slavery is always and everywhere absolutely and eternally wrong—a violence done to Nature—a daring warfare upon the economy and government of the Universe—a damning sin *upon* man, and *against* the ever living God—and being such, no Constitution nor Compact, no Statute not Decision, no Church nor Religion, no Bible nor imaginary God, can make it right—and it is therefore to be resisted and overthrown, even though its downfall should involve Governments and Religions, thrones and dominions, Bibles and false gods in indiscriminate ruin.

2. *Resolved*, That the Fugitive Slave Law recently passed in Congress, is but a stronger demonstration of the unjust, inhuman, God-defying, God-denying character of the American Constitution and Union; and we hereby avow our determination to treat it and its authors with deserved contempt, and the government from which it emanated with abhorrence and execration—while at the same time, in obedience to the higher and diviner law written by the Spirit of the Almighty on every human soul, we will encourage the poor bondmen and bond women to escape from their masters by offering them shelter, protection, concealment, or any other aid or comfort in our power to afford them.

3. *Whereas*, Under the new Fugitive Slave Law, certain Commissioners and other officers are to be appointed in the several Free States and Counties, to act in behalf of the Southern Slave-Master in the re-capture of his victims. Therefore.

Resolved, That we do ardently hope and pray that no man can be found to accept so diabolical an appointment, or to aid the Southern ruffians in any way, by barking and running as their bloodhound, or otherwise, in his fiendish work; but should there be found those who will thus degrade their manhood, who will thus sink themselves to a level with ravening wolves and howling hyenas, we call upon the people to hold them in unutterable abhorrence. We call upon women, whose sisters he would thus deliver back to shame and infamy as well as cruelty, to shun them as they would loathsome adders; and we charge and adjure all parents to teach their children to dread and avoid them, much more than they would the house-burner, the robber, or the midnight assassin.

4. *Resolved*, That the imprisonment of WM. L. CHAPLIN in the city of Washington for attempting to remove certain slaves from thence, that they might be *free*, would deepen the shame and guilt of this nation, only that the measure of its guilt and shame was full to overflowing before; and while we extend to him our most heartfelt sympathy, we will, on the alter where he is thus immolated for an act of Christian kindness and love, renew our consecration to the great and glorious work of shivering to fragments a government and Union that thus makes the holiest deed that man is able to perform a heinous crime.

5 *Resolved*, That John McLean, of Ohio, a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, by his flaming zeal in deciding fugitive slave cases in favor of the tyrant and ravisher, and against the victim and the ravished, and so ruining by heavy fines and costs many of the most humane and benevlount men in the nation, as well as hurling back to the woes of Slavery those who at every peril had escaped, deserves to have his name enrolled high on the scroll of everlasting infamy, with a Jeffries of England, or Nero on the throne of Rome.

6. *Resolved*, That it is a falsehood to call any party in this nation a *Free Soil Party*, since there is not a foot of *free soil* under the jurisdiction of the United States, nor any political party acknowledging allegiance to the government that is really seeking to make the soil free—even that which Mexico made free having been recklessly and ruthlessly torn from her, and with the consent of all existing political parties, consecrated as the hunting ground of the human kidnapper, where himself, or his not less human bloodhound, may hunt and seize the flying fugitive and hurl him headlong back to the horrors of the whipping post and the plantation.

7. *Resolved*, That the government of this country being open rebellion and treason against the government of God, by its support of Slavery, its slaughter of the Seminole Indians, its monstrous murder of 80,000 Mexicans and seizure of a vast extent of their country for slaveholding, the enactment of laws with fearful penalties against the highest, holiest and plainest demands of Christian kindness and philanthropy, any church that voluntarily supports that government, whose members vote in it, or are, (with their own consent,) voted for, is a scandal and libel on truth and goodness, a synagogue of Satan, an enemy of righteousness and of God, and as such, should be shunned as the most dangerous and fatal foe to the interests and happiness of man.

8. *Resolved*, That those ministers and religious teachers who confound such a religion with the doctrines and precepts of Jesus of Nazareth are either more stupid and blind than the savages of the wilderness, or they are the strongest evidence of the possibility of Total Depravity, and in either case, are as religious teachers, worthy only of the supreme contempt of the whole human race.

9. *Resolved*, That we behold with satisfaction and delight the decline of the slave-breeding and slave-buying Religion of this country, *North as well as South*; we rejoice in the dearth of its once boasted revivals; we are glad at the extinction of so many of its churches; the scattering of so many of its ministers into other and better employments, and the reduction of the number of students in most of the Theological Seminaries—for we behold in these things a bright promise and sure prophecy that the kingdom of heaven is at hand; that Peace and Righteousness will ere long supercede the war and Slavery that now desolate and darken the earth, and God be acknowledged as the common Father of all his children, and all his children love and acknowledge each other as brethern and members of the same great family.

The following were introduced by Samuel Brooke:

Resolved, That without the aid of the Church, Albert Barnes being witness, Slavery at this age and in this country could not exist.

Resolved, That as Slavery can only be maintained by fraud, deception and violence, it follows as a logical conclusion that the Church can resort to such means only as the above to maintatn it.

The following resolution was offered by C. S. S. Griffing, and adopted:

Resolved, That we recommend to the friends of the slave to immediately convene in their respective Counties, uniting with all who believe resistance to tyrants is obedience to God, and if possible, give such an expression against the Fugitive Slave Law as will prevent any person from accepting the infamous offices therein contemplated.

The following were also aodpted:

Resolved, That this Society has heard with great satisfaction, that the Anti-Slavery Women of Salem have determined to hold a Fair in that place, for the benefit of our treasury, at the close of the present year; and that we earnestly entreat the friends of the cause in other places to co-operate with them in this highly important instrumentality, that it may be made as efficient as possible.

Resolved, That Eli Thomas be requested to communicate to the Salem Monthly Meeting of Friends, the thanks of this Society for the use of their meeting house at the present Anniversary.

—AN effort is making to raise a present of one thousand doljars for Watson G. Haynes, as a tribute to his humane efforts in behalf of the sailors.

—RUNAWAYS.—On the 28th ult. a whole family of slaves, consisting of a mother and four children belonging to Mr. Jacob Feaster, near Middletown, Md. and two owned by Mr. John Simmons, made their escape. —*Balt. Clipper.*

Poetry.

AN INCIDENT OF THE FIRE AT HAMBURG.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

THE tower of old St. Nicholas soared upwards to the skies.
Like some huge piece of Nature's make, the growth of centuries;
You could not deem its crowding spires a work of human art,
They seemed to struggle lightward from a sturdy living heart.

Not Nature's self more freely speaks in chrystal or in oak.
Than, through the pious builder's hand, in that grey pile she spoke;
And as from acorn springs the sturdy oak, so, freely and alone,
Sprang from his heart this hymn to God, sung in obedient stone.

It seemed a wondrous freak of chance, so perfect, yet so rough,
A whim of Nature crystallized slowly in granite tough;
The thick spires yearned towards the sky in quaint, harmonious lines,
And in board sunlight basked and slept, like a grove of blasted pines.

Never did rock or stream or tree lay claim with better right.
To all the adorning sympathies of shadow and of light;
And, in that forest petrefied, as forester there dwells
Stout Herman, the old sacristan, sole lord of all its bells.

Surge leaping after surge, the fire roared onward red as blood,
Till half of Hamburg lay engulphed beneath the eddying flood;
For miles away, the fiery spray poured down its deadly rain,
And back and forth the billows sucked, and paused, and burst again.

From square to square with tiger leaps, rushed on the lustful fire,
The air to leward shuddered with the gasps of its desire;
And church and palace, which even now stood whelmed but to the knee,
Lift their black roofs like breakers lone amid the whirling sea.

Up in his tower old Herman sat and watched with quiet look;
His soul had trusted God too long to be at last forsook:
He could not fear, for surely God a pathway would unfold
Through this red sea for faithful hearts, as once he did of old.

But scarcely can he cross himself, or on his good saint call,
Before the sacrilegious flood o'erleaped the churchyard wall;
And, ere a *pater* half was said, 'mid smoke and crackling glare,
His island tower scarce juts his head above the wild despair.

Upon the peril's desperate peak his heart stood up sublime;
His first thought was for God above, his next was for his chime;
'Sing now and make your voices heard in hymns of praise,' cried he,
'As did the Israelites of old, safe walking through the sea!

'Through this red sea our God hath made the pathway safe to shore;
Our promised land stands full in sight; shout now as ne'er before!'
And as the tower came crushing down, the bells, in clear accord,
Pealed forth the grand old German hymn,—'All good souls, praise the Lord!'

From the New York Evangelist.

THE SELF-FREED.

BY WILLIAM OLAND BOURNE.

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any laws or regulations therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but SHALL BE DELIVERED UP on claim of the party to whom such service is due."—Constitution of the United States, Art. III. Sec. 2.

"Thou SHALT NOT DELIVER unto his master the servant who has escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place where he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.—Deut. xxiii. 15, 16.

I SAT at my door on an eve in Spring,
When the day with its toil was o'er,
And I listened and heard my children sing
The hymn I had often sung before;
The full round moon was just lighting the sky,
As it rose on the distant hill,
And the stars looked down with a placid eye
On the hamlet whose inmates were still.

The hyma had died out on the whispering breeze,
And lost was the sweet, tuneful sound,
While the shadows that fell from the tall poplar trees
Were stretching along on the ground;
When there stopped at the gate a man weary and worn,
Who leaned on the wicket and spoke,
As he asked for a place where to sleep till the morn—
He would go ere the neighbors awoke.

He took off his hat and he heaved a sigh,
As he asked for some bread to eat,
And my bosom swelled up, I could scarcely tell why,
For my heart with its sympathy beat;
I bade him walk in—I would hear his tale—
He should eat and stay there for the night—
So he left his old staff leaning by on a rail,
And a bundle just pushed out of sight.

He held his torn hat in his hand on his knee,
And he seemed very fearful at first,
But he saw of a friend he was certain in me,
And he told me his tale, e'en the worst;
He said—"I have come from the Land of the Slave—
Where the waters of Ocmulgee rolled—
And I'd rather lie down even now in my grave,
Than go back to the South to be sold."

With a prayer in his gaze, and a tremulous voice,
He begged me to help him along—
And I told him to cheer, in his soul to rejoice,
For I hated the Curse and the Wrong;
I would show him the way and send him to friends
Who would help him for Freedom to fly,
Where the free air floats and the free soul bends
To the Author of Freedom on high.

My heart welled up with a holy joy,
As I looked at my toil-worn guest,
And I bade my darling girl and boy
Sing a hymn ere they went to rest;
And they went and took of their little store,
And out of their heart they gave,
And we thanked our God that he had still more
In love for the flying slave.

'Tis the law of God in the human soul—
'Tis the Law in the Word Divine—
It shall live while the earth in its course shall roll,
IT SHALL LIVE IN THIS SOUL OF MINE!
Let the law of the land forge its bond of wrong!
I will help when the self-freed crave!
For the law in my soul, bright beaming and strong,
Bids me succor the flying slave!

NEW YORK, May 18, 1850.

Miscellany.

PRESENCE OF MIND.

BY THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

THE Roman *formula* for summoning an earnest concentration of the faculties upon any object whatever, that happened to be critically urgent, was *Hoc age*, "Mind *this!*" or, in other words, do not mind *that—non illud age*. The antithetic formula was "*aliud* agere," to mind something alien, or remote from the interest then clamoring for attention. Our modern military orders of "*Attention!*" and "*Eyes straight!*" were both included in the "*Hoc age.*" In the stern peremptoriness of this Roman formula we read a picturesque expression of the Roman character both as to its strength and its weakness—of the energy which brooked no faltering or delay (for beyond all other races the Roman was *natus rebus agendis*)—and also of the morbid craving for action, which was intolerant of any thing but the intensely practical.

In modern times, it is we of the Anglo-Saxon blood, that is, the British and the Americans of the United States, who inherit the Roman temperament with its vices and its fearful advantages of power. In the ancient Roman these vices appeared more barbarously conspicuous. We, the countrymen of Lord Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton, and at one time the leaders of austere thinking, cannot be supposed to shrink from the speculative through any native incapacity for sounding its depths. But the Roman had a real inaptitude for the speculative; to *him* nothing was real that was not practical. He had no metaphysics; he wanted the metaphysical instinct. There was no school of *native* Roman philosophy; the Roman was merely an eclectic or *dilettante* picking up the crumbs which fell from the Grecian tables; and even mathematics was so repulsive in its sublimer aspects to the Roman mind, that the very word mathematics had in Rome collapsed into another name for the dotages of astrology. The mathematician was a mere variety of expression for the wizard or the conjurer.

From this unfavorable aspect of the Roman intellect, it is but justice that we should turn away to contemplate those situations in which that same intellect showed itself preternaturally strong. To face a sudden danger by a corresponding weight of sudden counsel or sudden evasion—*that* was a privilege essentially lodged in the Roman mind. But in every nation some minds much more than others are representative of the national type; they are normal minds, reflecting, as in a focus, the characteristics of the race. Thus Louis XIV. has been held to be the idealized expression of the French character; and among the Romans there cannot be a doubt that the first Cæsar offers in a rare perfection the revelation of that peculiar grandeur which belonged to the children of Romulus.

What *was* that grandeur? We do not need, in this place, to attempt its analysis. One feature will suffice for our purpose. The late celebrated John Foster, in his essay on decision of character, among the accidents of life which might serve to strengthen the natural tendencies to such a character, or to promote its development, rightly insists on *desertion*. To find itself in solitude, and still more to find itself thrown upon that state of abandonment by sudden treachery, crushes the feeble mind, but rouses a terrific reaction of haughty self-assertion in that order of spirits which matches and measures itself against difficulty and danger. There is something corresponding to this case of human treachery in the sudden caprices of fortune. A danger, offering itself unexpectedly in some momentary change of blind external agencies, assumes to the feelings the character of a perfidy accomplished by mysterious powers, and calls forth something of the same resentment, and in a gladiatorial intellect something of the same spontaneous resistance. A sword that breaks in the very crisis of a duel, a horse killed by a flash of lightning in the moment of collision with the enemy, a bridge carried away by an avalanche at the instant of a commencing retreat, affect the feelings like dramatic incidents emanating from a human will. This man they confound and paralyze, that man they rouse into resistance, as by a personal provocation and insult. And if it happens that these opposite effects show themselves in cases wearing a national importance, they raise what would else have been a mere casualty into the tragic or the epic grandeur of a fatality. The superb character, for instance, of Cæsar's intellect throws a colossal shadow as of predestination over the most trivial incidents of his career. On the morning of Pharsalia, every man who reads a record of that mighty event feels* by a secret instinct that an earthquake is approaching which must determine the final distribution of the ground, and the relations among the whole family of man through a thousand generations. Precisely the inverse case is realized in some modern sections of history, where the feebleness or the inertia of the presiding intellect communicates a character of triviality to events that otherwise are of paramount historical importance. In Cæsar's case, simply through the perfection of his preparations arrayed against all conceivable contingencies, there is an impression left as of some incarnate Providence, veiled in a human form, ranging through the ranks of the legions; while, on the contrary, in the modern cases to which we allude, a mission, seemingly authorized by inspiration, is suddenly quenched, like a torch falling into water, by the careless character of the superintending intellect. Neither case is without its appropriate interest. The spectacle of a vast historical dependency, pre-organized by an intellect of unusual grandeur, wears the grace of congruity and reciprocal proportion. And on the other hand, a series of mighty events contingent upon the motion this way or that of a frivolous hand, or suspended on the breath of caprice, suggests the wild and fanntastic disproportions of ordinary life, when the mighty masquerade moves on forever through successions of the gay and the solemn—of the petty and the majestic.

Cæsar's cast of character owed its impressiveness to the combination which it offered of moral grandeur and monumental immobility, such as we see in Marius, with the dazzling intellectual versatility found in the Gracchi, in Sylla, in Cataline, in Antony. The comprehension and the absolute perfection of his prescience did not escape the eye of Lucan, who describes him as—"Nil actum reputans, si quid superesset agendum." A fine lambent gleam of his character escapes also in that magnificent fraction of a line, where he is described as one incapable of learning the style and sentiments suited to a private interest—"Indocilis privata loqui."

There has been a disposition manifested among modern writers to disturb the traditional characters of Cæsar and his chief antagonist. Audaciously to disparage Cæsar, and without a shadow of any new historic grounds to exalt his feeble competitor, has been adopted as the best chance for filling up the mighty gulf between them. Lord Brougham, for instance, on occasion of a dinner given by the Cinque Ports at Dover to the Duke of Wellington, vainly attempted to raise our countryman by unfounded and romantic depreciations of Cæsar. He alleged that Cæsar had contended only with barbarians. Now, *that* happens to be the literal truth as regards Pompey. The victories on which his early reputation was built were won from semi-barbarians—luxurious, it is true, but also effeminate in a degree never suspected at Rome until the next generation. The slight but summary contest of Cæsar with Pharnaces, the son of Mithridates, dissipated at once the cloud of ignorance in which Rome had been involved on this subject by the vast distance and the total want of familiarity with Oriental habits. But Cæsar's chief antagonists, those whom Lord Brougham specially indicated, viz., the Gauls, were *not* barbarians. As a military people, they were in a stage of civilization next to that of the Romans. They were quite as much *aguerris*, hardened and seasoned to war, as the children of Rome. In certain military habits they were even superior. For purposes of war, four races were then pre-eminent in Europe, viz., the Romans, the Macedonians, certain select tribes among the mixed population of the Spanish peninsula, and finally the Gauls. These were all open to the recruiting parties of Cæsar; and among them all he had deliberately assigned his preference to the Gauls. The famous legion, who carried the *Alauda* (the lark) upon their helmets, was raisedin Gaul from Cæsar's private funds. They composed a select and favored division in his army, and, together with the famous tenth legion, constituted a third part of his forces—a third numerically on the day of battle, but virtually a half. Even the rest of Cæsar's army had been for so long a space recruited in the Gauls, Transalpine as well as Cisalpine, that at Pharsalia the bulk of his forces is known to have been Gaulish. There were more reasons than one for concealing that fact. The policy of Cæsar was to conceal it not less from Rome than from the army itself. But the truth became known at last to all wary observers. Lord Brougham's objection to the quality of Cæsar's enemies falls away at once when it is collated with the deliberate composition of Cæsar's own army. Besides that, Cæsar's enemies were not in any exclusive sense Gauls. The German tribes, the Spanish, the Helvetian, the Illyrian, Africans of every race, and Moors; the islanders of the Mediterranean, and the mixed populations of Asia, had all been faced by Cæsar. And if it is alleged that the forces of Pompey, however superior in numbers, were at Pharsalia largely composed of an Asiatic rabble, the answer is—that precisely of such a rabble were the hostile armies composed from which he had won his laurels. False and windy reputations are sown thickly in history; but never was there a reputation more thoroughly histrionic than that of Pompey. The late Dr. Arnold of Rugby, among a million of other crotchets, did (it is true) make a pet of Pompey; and he was encouraged in this caprice (which had for its origin the doctor's *political** animosity to Cæsar) by one military critic, viz., Sir William Napier. This distinguished soldier conveyed messages to Dr. Arnold, warning him against the popular notion, that Pompey was a poor strategist. Now, had there been any Roman state-paper office, which Sir William could be supposed to have searched and weighed against the statements of surviving history, we might, in deference to Sir William's great experience and talents, have consented to a rehearing of the case. Unfortunately, no new materials have been discovered; nor is it alleged that the old ones are capable of being thrown into new combinations, so as to reverse or to suspend the old adjudications. The judgment of history stands; and among the records which it involves, none is more striking than this—that, while Cæsar and Pompey were equally assaulted by sudden surprises, the first invariably met the sudden danger (sudden but never unlooked-for) by counter resources of evasion. He showed a new front, as often as his situation exposed a new peril. At Pharsalia, where the cavalry of Pompey was far superior to his own, he anticipated and was in full readiness for the particular manœuvre by which it was attempted to make this superiority available against himself. By a new formation of his troops he foiled the attack, and caused it to recoil upon the enemy. Had Pompey then no rejoinder ready for meeting this reply? No. His one arrow being shot, his quiver was exhausted. Without an effort at parrying any longer, the mighty game was surrendered as desperate. "Check to the king!" was heard in silent submission; and no further stratagem was invoked even in silent prayer, but the stratagem of flight. Yet Cæsar himself, objects a celebrated doctor (viz., Bishop Warburton), was reduced by his own rashness at Alexandria to a condition of peril and embarrassment not less alarming than the condition of Pompey at Pharsalia. How far this suprise might be reconcilable with Cæsar's military credit, is a question yet undecided; but this at least is certain, that he was equal to the occasion; and, if the surprise was all but fatal, the evasion was all but miraculous. Many were the sudden surprises which Cæsar had to face before and after this—on the shores of Britain, at Marseilles, at Munda, at Thapsus—from all of which he issued triumphantly, failing only as to that final one from which he had in pure nobility of heart announced his determination to shelter himself under no precautions.

Such cases of personal danger and escape are exciting to the imagination, from the disproportion between the interests of an individual and the interests of a whole nation which for the moment happen to be concurrent. The death or the escape of Cæsar, at one moment rather than another, would make a difference in the destiny of many nations. And in kind, though not in degree, the same interest has frequently attached to the fortunes of a prince or military leader. Effectually the same dramatic character belongs to any struggle with sudden danger, though not (like Cæsar's) successful. That it was *not* successful becomes a new reason for pursuing it with interest; since equally in that result, as in one more triumphant, we read the altered course by which history is henceforward destined to flow.

For instance, how much depended—what a weight of history hung in suspense—upon the evasions or attempts at evasion, of Charles I. He was a prince of great ability; and yet it confounds us to observe, with how little of foresight, or of circumstantial inquiry, either as regarded things or persons, he entered upon these difficult enterprises of escape from the vigilance of military guardians. His first escape, viz., that into the Scottish camp before Newark, was not surrounded with any circumstances of difficulty. His second escape from Hampton Court had become a matter of more urgent policy, and was proportionally more difficult of execution. He was attended on that occasion by two gentlemen (Berkely and Ashburnham), upon whose qualities of courage and readiness, and upon whose acquaintance with the accidents, local or personal, that surrounded their path, all was staked. Yet one of these gentlemen was always suspected of treachery, and both were imbecile as regarded that sort of wisdom on which it was possible for a royal person to rely. Had the questions likely to arise been such as belong to a masquerading adventure, these gentlemen might have been qualified for the situation. As it was, they sank in mere distraction under the responsibilities of the occasion. The king was as yet in safety. At Lord Southampton's country mansion, he enjoyed the protection of a loyal family ready to face any risk in his behalf; and his retreat was entirely concealed. Suddenly this scene changes. The military commander in the Isle of Wight is acquainted with the king's situation, and brought into his presence, together with a military guard, though no effort had been made to exact securities from his honor in behalf of the king. His single object was evidently to arrest the king. His military honor, his duty to the parliament, his private interest, all pointed to the same result, viz., the immediate apprehension of the fugitive prince. What was there in the opposite scale to set against these notorious motives? Simply the fact that he was nephew to the king's favorite chaplain, Dr. Hammond. What rational man, in a case of that nature, would have relied upon so poor a trifle? Yet even this inconsiderable bias was much more than balanced by another of the same kind but in the opposite direction. Colonel Hammond was nephew to the king's chaplain, but in the meantime he was the husband of Cromwell's niece; and upon Cromwell privately, and the whole faction of the Independents politically, he relied for all his hopes of advancement. The result was, that, from mere inertia of mind and criminal negligence in his two attendants, the poor king had run right into the custody of the very jailer whom his enemies would have selected by preference.

Thus, then, from fear of being made a prisoner, Charles had quietly walked into the military prison of Carisbrook Castle. The very security of this prison, however, might throw the governor off his guard. Another escape might be possible; and again an escape was arranged. It reads like some leaf torn from the records of a lunatic hospital, to hear its circumstances and the particular point upon which it split. Charles was to make his exit through a window. This window, however, was fenced by iron bars; and these bars had been to a certain extent eaten through with *aqua fortis*. The king had succeeded in pushing his head through, and upon that result he relied for his escape; for he connected this trial with the following strange maxim or postulate, viz., that wheresoever the head could pass, there the whole person could pass. It needs not to be said, that, in the final experiment, this absurd rule was found not to hold good. The king stuck fast about the chest and shoulders, and was extricated with some difficulty. Had it even been otherwise, the attempt would have failed; for, on looking down from amidst the iron bars, the king beheld, in the imperfect light, a number of people who were not among his accomplices.

Equal in fatuity, almost one hundred and fifty years later, were the several attempts at escape concerted on behalf of the French royal family. The abortive escape to Varennes is now familiarly known to all the world, and impeaches the good sense of the king himself not less than of his friends. The arrangements for the falling in with the cavalry escort could not have been worse managed had they been intrusted to children. But even the general outline of the scheme, an escape in a collective family party—father, mother, children and servants—and the king himself, whose features were known to millions, not even withdrawing himself from the public gaze at the stations for changing horses—all this is calculated to perplex and sadden the pitying reader with the idea that some supernatural infatuation had bewildered the predestined victims. Meantime an earlier escape than this to Varennes had been planned, viz., to Brussels. The preparations for this, which have been narrated by Madame de Campan, were conducted with a disregard of concealment even more astounding to people of ordinary good sense. "Do you really need to escape at all?" would have been the question of many a lunatic; "if you do, surely you need also to disguise your preparations for escape."

But alike the madness, or the providential wisdom, of such attempts commands our profoundest interest; alike—whether conducted by a Cæsar or by the helpless members of families utterly unfitted to act independently for themselves. These attempts belong to history, and it is in that relation that they become philosophically so impressive. Generations through an infinite series are contemplated by us as silently awaiting the turning of a sentinel round a corner, or the casual echo of a footstep. Dynasties have trepidated on the chances of a sudden cry from an infant carried in a basket; and the safety of empires has been suspended, like the descent of an avalanche, upon the moment earlier or the moment later of a cough or a sneeze. And, high above all, ascends solemnly the philosophic truth, that the least things and the greatest are bound together as elements equally essential of the mysterious universe.

* "Feels by a secret instinct." A sentiment of this nature is finely expressed by Lucan in the passage beginning, "Advenisse diem," &c. The circumstance by which Lucan chiefly defeats the grandeur and simplicities of the truth is, the monstrous numerical exaggeration of the combatants and the killed at Pharsalia.

* It is very evident that Dr. Arnold could not have understood the position of politics in Rome when he allowed himself to make a favorite of Pompey. The Dr. hated aristocrats as he hated the gates of Erebus. Now Pompey was not only the leader of a most selfish aristocracy, but also their tool. Secondly, as if this were not bad enough, that section of the aristocracy to which he had dedicated his services was an odious oligarchy; and to this oligarchy, again, though nominally its head, he was in effect the most submissive of tools. Cæsar, on the other hand, if a democrat in the sense of working by democratic agencies, was bending all his efforts to the reconstruction of a new, purer, and enlarged aristocracy, no longer reduced to the necessity of buying and selling the people in mere self-defence. The everlasting war of bribery, operating upon universal poverty, the internal disease of Roman society, would have been redressed by Cæsar's measures, and was redressed according to the degree in which those measures were really brought into action. New judicatures were wanted, new judicial laws, a new aristocracy, by slow degrees a new people, and the right of suffrage exercised within new restrictions—all these things were needed for the cleansing of Rome, and that Cæsar would have accomplished this labor of Hercules was the true cause of his death. The scoundrels of the oligarchy felt their doom to be approaching. It was the just remark of Napoleon that Brutus (but still more, we may say, Cicero), though falsely accredited as a patriot, was, in fact, the most exclusive and the most selfish of aristocrats.

FATE DAYS.

IT is a difficult puzzle to reconcile the existence of certain superstitions that continue to have wide influence with the enlightenment of the nineteenth century. When we have read glowing paragraphs about the wonderful progress accomplished by the present generation; when we have regarded the giant machinery in operation for the culture of the people—moved, in great part, by the collective power of individual charity; when we have examined the stupendous results of human genius and ingenuity which are now laid bare to the lowliest in the realm; we turn back, it must be confessed, with a mournful despondency, to mark the debasing influence of the old superstititions which have survived to the present time.

The superstitions of the ancients formed part of their religion. They consulted oracles as now men pray. The stars were the arbiters of their fortunes. Natural phenomena, as lightning and hurricanes, were, to them, awful expressions of the anger of their particular deities. They had there *dies atri* and their *dies albi*; the former were marked down in their calendars with a black character, to denote ill-luck, and the latter were painted in white characters to signify bright and propitious days. They followed the finger-posts of their teachers. Faith gave dignity to the tenets of the star-gazer and fire-worshipper.

The priests of old taught their disciples to regard six particular days in the year as days fraught with unusual danger to mankind. Men were enjoined not to let blood on these black days, nor to imbibe any liquid. It was devoutly believed that he who ate goose on one of these black days would surely die within forty more; and that any little stranger who made his appearance on one of the *dies atri* would surely die a sinful and violent death. Men were further enjoined to let blood from their right arm on the seventh or fourteenth of March; from the left arm on the eleventh of April; and from either arm on the third or sixth of May, that they might avoid pestilential diseases. These barbaric observances, when brought before people in illustrations of the mental darkness of the ancients, are considered at once to be proof positive of their abject condition. We thereupon congratulated ourselves upon living in the nieteenth century; when such foolish superstitions are laughed at; and perhaps our vanity is not a little flattered by the contrast which presents itself, between our own highly cultivated condition, and the wretched state of our ancestors.

Yet Mrs. Flimmins will not undertake a sea-voyage on a Friday; nor would she on any account allow her daughter Mary to be married on that day of the week. She has great pity for the poor Red Indians who will not do certain things while the moon presents a certain appearance, and who attach all kinds of powers to poor dumb brutes; yet if her cat purrs more than usual, she accepts the warning, and abandons the trip she had promised herself on the morrow.

Miss Nippers subscribes largely to the fund for eradicating superstitions from the minds of the wretched inhabitants of Kamschatka; and while she is calculating the advantages to be derived from a mission to the South Sea Islands, to do away with the fearful superstitious reverence in which those poor dear islanders hold the native flea: a coal pops from her fire, and she at once augurs from its shape, an abundance of money that will enable her to set her pious undertaking in operation; but on no account will she commence collecting subscriptions for the anti-drinking-slave-grown-sugar-in-tea society, because she has always remarked that Monday is her unlucky day. On a Monday her poodle died, and on a Monday she caught that severe cold at Brighton, from the effects of which she is afraid she will never recover.

Mrs. Carmine is a very strong-minded woman. Her unlucky day is Wednesday. On a Wednesday she first caught that flush which she has never been able to chase from her cheeks, and on one of these fatal days her Maria took the scarlet fever. Therefore, she will not go to a pic-nic on a Wednesday, because she feels convinced that the day will turn out wet, or that the wheel will come off the carriage. Yet the other morning, when a gipsy was caught telling her eldest daughter her fortune, Mrs. Carmine very properly reproached the first-born for her weakness, in giving any heed to the silly mumblings of the old woman. Mrs. Carmine is considered to be a woman of uncommon acuteness. She attaches no importance whatever to the star under which a child is born—does not think there is a pin to choose between Jupiter and Neptune; and she has a positive contempt for ghosts; but she believes in nothing that is begun, continued, or ended on a Wednesday.

Mis Crumple, on the contrary, has seen many ghosts—in fact, is by this time quite intimate with one or two of the mysterious brotherhood; but at the same time she is at a loss to understand how any woman in her senses can believe Thursday to be a more fortunate day than Wednesday, or why Monday is to be black-balled from the Mrs. Jones' calendar. She can state, on her oath, that the ghost of her old schoolfellow, Eliza Artichoke, appeared at her bedside on a certain night and she distinctly saw the mole on its left cheek, which poor Eliza, during her brief career, had vainly endeavored to eradicate, with all sorts of poisonous things. The ghost, moreover, lisped—so did Eliza! This was all clear enough to Miss Crumple, and she considered it a personal insult for anybody to suggest that her vivid apparitions existed only in her own over-wrought imagination. She had an affection for her ghostly visitors, and would not hear a word to their disparagement.

The unearthly warnings which Mrs. Piptoss had received had well-nigh spoilt all her furniture. When a relative dies, the fact is not announced to her in the commonplace form of a letter—no, an invisible sledge-hammer falls upon her Broadwood, an invisible power upsets her loo-table, all the doors of her house unanimously blow open, or a coffin flies out of the fire into her lap.

Mrs. Grumple, who is a very economical housewife, looks forward to the day when the moon re-appears—on which occasion she turns her money-taking care not to look at the pale lady through glass. This observance, she devoutly believes, will bring her good fortune. When Miss Caroline has a knot in her lace, she looks for a present; and when Miss Amelia snuffs the candle out, it is her faith that the act defers her marriage for a twelvemonth. Any young lady who dreams the same dream two consecutive Fridays, will tell you that her visions will "come true."

Yet these are exactly the ladies who most deplore the "gross state of superstition" in which many "benighted savages" live, and willingly subscribe their money for its eradication. The superstition so generally connected with Friday, may easily be traced to its source. It undoubtedly and confessedly had its origin in scriptural history: it is the day on which the Saviour suffered. The superstition is the more revolting from this circumstance; and it is painful to find that it exists among persons of education. There is no branch of the public service, for instance, in which so much sound mathematical knowledge is to be found, as in the Navy. Yet who are more superstitious than sailors, from the admiral down to the cabin boy? Friday fatality is still strong among them. Some years ago, in order to lessen this folly, it was determined that a ship should be laid down on a Friday, and launched on a Friday; that she should be called "Friday," and that she should commence her first voyage on a Friday. After much difficulty a captain was found who owned to the name of Friday; and after a great deal more difficulty men were obtained, so little superstitious, as to form a crew. Unhappily, this experiment had the effect of confirming the superstition it was meant to abolish. The "Friday" was lost—was never, in fact, heard of from the day she set sail.

Day-fatality, as Miss Nippers interprets it, is simply the expression of an undisciplined and extremely weak mind; for, if any person will stoop to reason with her on her aversion to Mondays, he may ask her whether the death of the poodle or the catching of her cold are the two greatest calamities of her life; and, if so, whether it is her opinion that Monday is set apart, in the scheme of Nature, so far as it concerns her, in a black character. Whether for her insignificant self there is a special day accursed! Mrs. Carmine is such a strong-minded woman, that we approach her with no small degree of trepidation. Wednesday is her *dies ater*, because, in the first place, on a Wednesday she imprudently exposed herself, and is suffering from the consequences; and, in the second place, on a Wednesday her Maria took the scarlet fever. So she has marked Wednesday down in her calendar with a black character; yet her contempt for stars and ghosts is prodigious. Now there is a consideration to be extended to the friends of ghosts, which Day-fatalists cannot claim. Whether or not deceased friends take a more airy and flimsy form, and adopt the invariable costume of a sheet to visit the objects of their earthly affections, is a question which the shrewdest thinkers and the profoundest logicians have debated very keenly, but without ever arriving at any satisfactory conclusion.

The strongest argument against the positive existence of ghosts is, that they appear only to people of a certain temperament, and under certain exciting circumstances. The obtuse, matter-of-fact man, never sees a ghost; and we may take it as a natural law, that none of these airy visitants ever appeared to an attorney. But the attorney, Mr. Fee Simple, we are assured, holds Saturday to be an unlucky day. It was on a Saturday that his extortionate bill, in poor Mr. G.'s case, was cut down by the taxing master; and it was on a Saturday that a certain heavy bill was duly honored, upon which he had hoped to reap a large sum in the shape of costs. Therefore Mr. Fee Simple believes that the destinies have put a black mark against Saturday, so far as he is concerned.

The Jew who thought that the thunder-storm was the consequence of his having eaten a slice of bacon, did not present a more ludicrous picture, than Mr. Fee Simple presents with his condemned Saturday.

We have an esteem for ghost-inspectors, which it is utterly impossible to extend to Day-fatalists. Mrs. Piptoss, too, may be pitied; but Mog, turning her money when the moon makes her re-appearance, is an object of ridicule. We shall neither be astonished, nor express condolence, if the present, which Miss Caroline anticipates from the knot in her lace, be not forthcoming; and as for Miss Amelia, who has extinguished the candle, and to the best of her belief lost her husband for a twelvemonth, we can only wish for her, that when she is married, her lord and master will shake her faith in the prophetic power of snuffers. But of all the superstitions that have survived to the present time, and are to be found in force among people of education and a thoughtful habit, Day-fatalism is the most general, as it is the most unfounded and preposterous. It is a superstition, however, in which many great and powerful thinkers have shared, and by which they have been guided; it owes much of its present influence to this fact; but reason, Christianity, and all we have comprehended of the great scheme of which we form part, alike tend to demonstrate its absurdity, and utter want of all foundation.—*Household Words.*

THE SCHOLAR'S BREECHES.

My son was lately obliged, under stress of weather, to put into St. John's in Newfoundland. He went to an inn and glancing at a paper published at that place, he found the well known anecdote of the Rev. Dr. Neander's having lectured to the students, minus his pantaloons, copied from the American journals. The anecdote is almost universally believed in Germany, which shows that it must have been in keeping. The pious, learned, firm, and gentle Dr. Neander, of Berlin, was indeed a most absent man; still, I am sorry I must spoil what to many no doubt appears a good joke. The facts of that famous story are these: Dr. Neander never paid the slightest attention to personal comfort or household affairs.—His sister, who told me the story herself, provided for everything. Among other things she placed the articles he was to wear every day before his bed.—Dr. Neander had never been known to have ordered any clothes; but one day the tailor met him and said, "Doctor, I think you ought to have a new pair of pantaloons." "Very well," replied the great man, and in due time the breeches made their appearance. They were placed, however, without the knowledge of his sister before his bed, and in the morning they served to encase the Doctor's legs. He went to the university building to lecture, and when his sister entered his room and found there the old pantaloons, she did indeed believe that he had forgotten to put on any, and was, as might well be supposed, in despair. She went at once in a carriage to receive him the moment he should come out. Her anxiety during the time she waited there was extreme, and equally great was her joy and gratitude when she saw her brother on whom she doated, leaving the large portal of that beautiful building, with breeches on like any other Christian. She herself had the heartiest laugh at her own anxiety, and told every one of it. The story was improved by making it a degree worse; and thus has travelled all over the European continent, passed to another hemisphere, and to a certainty will find its way into Indian and Australian papers, and ultimately into the foot-notes of some biography of that distinguished ornament of our times.

Stories of scholars' breeches seem altogether to travel fast and far. Leiber, in his Reminiscences of an intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr the Historian, relates through what sufferings he had passed in Greece, whither he had gone to fight against the Turks; how he had managed to get to Rome, although then destitute of all means, and how kindly he was received by Niebuhr. This admirable scholar and ambassador of Prussia had invited Lieber to dinner, and shown impatience when the traveller wished to decline the honor on account of his shabby dress. I introduce the author's own word's:—

"I recollect that dinner with delight. His (Niebuhr's) conversation abounding in rich and various knowledge and striking observations; his great kindness; the acquaintance I made with Mrs. Niebuhr; his lovely children, who were so beautiful, that when, at a later period, I used to walk with them, the women would exclaim, "*Ma guardate, guardate, che angeli!*"—a good dinner (which I had not enjoyed for a long time), in a high vaulted room, the ceiling of which was painted in the style of Italian palaces; a picture of the mild Francia close by; the sound of the murmuring fountain in the garden, and the refreshing beverages in coolers, which I had seen but the day before represented in some of the most masterly pictures of the Italian schools; in short, my consciousness of being at dinner with Niebuhr in his house in Rome—and all this in so bold relief to my late and not unfrequently disgusting sufferings, would have rendered the moment one of almost perfect enjoyment and happiness, had it not been for an annoyance, which I have no doubt will appear here a mere trifle. However, reality often differs widely from its description on paper. Objects of great effect for the moment become light as air; and others, shadows and vapors in reality, swell into matters of weighty consideration when subjected to the recording pen; a truth, by the way, which applies to our daily life, as well as to transactions of of vaster regions—and it is, therefore, the sifting tact which constitutes one of the most necessary yet difficult requisites for a sound historian.

"My dress consisted as yet of nothing better than a pair of unblacked shoes, such as are not unfrequently worn in the Levant; a pair of socks of coarse Greek wool; the brownish pantaloons frequently worn by sea-captains in the Mediterranean; and a blue frock coat, through which two balls had passed—a fate to which the blue cloth cap had likewise been exposed. The socks were exceedingly short, hardly covering my ankles, and so, indeed, were the pantaloons; so that when I was in a sitting position they refused me the charity of meeting, with an obstinacy which reminded me of the irreconcilable temper of the two brothers in Schiller's Bride of Messina. There happened to dine with Mr. Niebuhr another lady besides Mrs. Niebuhr, and my embarrassment was not small when, towards the conclusion of the dinner, the children rose and played about on the ground, and I saw my poor extremities exposed to all the frank remarks of quick-sighted childhood; fearing as I did, at the same time, the still more trying moments after dinner, when I should be obliged to take coffee near the ladies, unprotected by the kindly shelter of the table. Mr. Niebuhr observed perhaps that something troubled me, and redoubled, if possible, his kindness."

This passage was copied by many reviews in England and here. One said that it reminded the reader of the best passages in Gil Blas; another found in it the quiet humor of Goldsmith, and in less than a few months, the breeches story passed into almost all the languages of Europe, even into those into which the book had not been translated. Not long after, the author of the Reminiscences paid a visit to a near relation in the Island of Porto Rico. There he called upon the Governor at San Juan, to whom he had a letter of introduction. The Governor looked at the letter, at Mr. Lieber, at a newspaper before him, and at last asked, "Are you the gentleman who dined at Mr. Niebuhr's at Rome and could not make certain articles of dress meet in harmony?—See here, sir, I have received this morning by a vessel from Cadiz a file of Madrid papers, and have a few moments ago been reading this amusing passage;" pointing out to him the Spanish translation of a French translation of the passage which I have copied. It was a humorous introduction for as fine a luncheon as the West Indies can afford This story I have been told by the person most interested in the transaction. He, I hope, will not consider it a trespass, that I have ventured to relate how swiftly the story travelled, since the story itself was given to the public by his own pen.

Let learned bodies or individual philosophers resolve what it is that gives such mighty eagle's wings, not indeed to the pants of sages, but at least to the stories which relate their adventures and encounters.

There is a fairy story of a princess so delicate and of such refined feelings, that she fainted when her maids pronounced the name of a man in her presence, and that her teacher was obliged to re-write history for her, substituting the names of females for those of kings and generals. Poor thing! A fairy changed her into a pair of pantaloons which was sold to a cloth-dealer, from whom her lover happened to buy it. It is needless to pursue the story further, which has been introduced merely to show, that there are indeed some breeches whose history may be worthy of record, but why, I ask, should the unpretending pants of scholars thus meet with a Trans-Atlantic and Cis-Atlantic interest, almost as great at the time, and certainly more enduring than the establishment of a new German imperial crown.—WOODSTOCK.—*Literary World.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

——THE mortal remains of the once celebrated Indian juggler, Ramo Samee, were interred on Sunday afternoon in old St. Pancras Churchyard. The body was followed to the grave by a large concourse of spectators.

——JEWS think that the first thing a soul new-born by death does, is to wash itself, for which reason all the water in the house is thrown away, as having thus been rendered unclean. The angel of death also washes his sword.—*Southey's Commonplace Book.*

——SIR Frederick Thesiger tells a very good story of Mr. George Hudson, M.P. A *ci-devant* friend of the monarch cut him the other day in the lobby of the House of Commons, upon which his Irish Majesty, turning round, exclaimed, "Hallo, you sir, what do you mean? What do you cut me for? I've £400,000, left!!!"

——THE LATE KING OF HOLLAND'S GARDENS.—Everything on which King William II., bestowed so much princely taste, as well as pains and expense in acquiring, seems doomed to dispersion. First, all his horses, favorite dogs, stable establishment, and most of the carriages, were consigned to the auctioneers; next, the royal collections of works of art were sold within the palace that he built; and now one of the most rare and splendid assemblages of plants in Europe, to the forming of which the late king had devoted almost incalculable pains and expense, is being disposed of in the same unceremonious manner, and being carted away in all directions! To those who saw the royal palace a month ago in all its princely splendor, the scene which it now presents is truly deplorable; and it is most deeply felt by all his subjects,